

ISSN 1343-8980

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年 報
令和三年度
(第25号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2021
Volume XXV

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所
東京・2022・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
Soka University
Tokyo・2022

Avadāna Episodes

(Texts from the Split Collection 5)

Harry FALK & Elisabeth STEINBRÜCKNER

Abstract:

A severely fragmented sheet of birch-bark from Gandhara was found inscribed with eleven stories of the *avadāna* type, which means that they center around episodes involving laypeople and monks, but do not have the Buddha as a protagonist. The stories deal with ascetics of other communities, and they discuss the value of luxury or present a ghost as the cause of illness. The first story appears to be a long adaptation of the Aṅgulimāla episode. Of particular interest for the history of Buddhism is the second story concerning the self-immolation of a layman, which constitutes the earliest mention of such an act in an Indian Buddhist context.

Keywords:

Split Collection; *avadāna*; Aṅgulimāla; seal; *pravrajyā*; self-immolation; sickness; *yavanānī*.

The Split Collection

After a preliminary description of the so-called “Split collection of Kharoṣṭī texts” was presented (Falk 2011), detailed examinations of four texts were published: 1) recto (Falk & Karashima 2012) and verso of a manuscript of an early Prajñāpāramitā text along with parallels from the first Chinese translations (Falk & Karashima 2013), 2) a Dharmapada with 91 recognizable stanzas (Falk 2015), and 3) a single segment of an Aṣṭakavarga manuscript showing 4 verses known from the Pāli Suttanipāta (Falk 2011: 14). This last fragment with its very unusual script allows us to confirm that a second part of the Split Collection, which was packed in transparent foil, had appeared in the market, prepared for interested parties in photographs showing the segments arranged in what appears to be their original order. One of the parts placed by chance on top of the collection in another photograph displays the same handwriting as the above-mentioned Aṣṭakavarga segment, and in fact shows stanzas immediately neighboring those of the published part. This is proof that the collection on offer belongs to the Split Collection,¹ it could be called “Split Collection-B” with ours running under “A”, but as there are only five mss present in “A” it will be best to understand every number higher than 5 as belonging to “B”, – or “C”, should more parts turn up.

4) The most recent contribution was published in this journal by the present two authors (2020) and deals with an episode of the Buddha’s life, the “miracle at Śrāvastī”,

¹ Cf. Salomon 2014: 9f.

in metrical form.

5) The present paper concludes the publication of the five mss of the Split Collection that were provided by the owners from 2004 onward and presented by us summarily in 2011.² It contains short texts which are twice referred to as *avadānas* in a sort of title line. The stories' actors are contemporary monks who interact with laypeople, kings, the *saṃgha* etc., rather than the Buddha in bygone times. The stories discuss topics concerned with the admission to and life within the fold of the order.

The manuscript – its physical features

Although once part of a single collection, the mss of the Split Collection are rather heterogeneous. The most obvious difference is material. Good and sturdy birch-bark is known from the Khotan Dharmapada with an almost board-like nature, with no branch sprouts, wrinkles or open spaces. The younger the mss are, the worse the bark becomes, and the more brittle and fragmentary the condition today. The bark for our *avadānas* once was of a rather strong nature. However, the segments that came to light when the ms was unrolled are not of uniform nature, and it seems that when the roll was prepared for its final deposition, parts from another ms were packed with it. Still worse, in the very middle of the roll a mass of tiny fragments were encountered, often smaller than the transparent triangles used by the preparator, so that he decided not to paste them on the glass panes. It looked as if someone had emptied layers of decomposed sediments from a ms box onto our sheet, already upholstered by stray fragments of yet another text, to be rolled into a sort of final cigar. This bark roll has lost part of its material at the right side when it stood upright in a container, but it was not broken in two in the middle as so many other rolls. There are lines with their inscribed part more or less preserved from beginning to end, unlike other collections where substantial parts of the rolls were deliberately truncated and only one part buried with the ashes of their former collector.

Although the writings on both sides of the sheet here edited belong to one single text, they are the products of two scribes. The first one, on side A, has a more equalized handwriting, with no footmarks. His letters may carry more or less ink, but they are of a rather uniform size. He uses a small dot “ • ” and the leafy rosette “ ☯ ” to end sentences and chapters. The second clerk varies the size of his letters, he adds footmarks and uses the circle “ ○ ” and the spoked wheel “ * ” to separate sentences and chapters. He uses a *sa* with overbar (ṣa) in the very first line on the backside.

In addition, the vocabulary differs. For example, while the A-side presents the spelling *ayiṣva* (Skt. *āyuṣmān*) throughout, the B-side shows *ayiṣpa*, once (B14/15) *ayiṣpa*. All this is evidence to show that the B-scribe is the younger of the two monks. The gap in their personal age may have been considerable, but the actual periods of writing need not have differed much, if at all.

C14 dating

The introduction of footmarks and overstrokes into Kharoṣṭhī calligraphy must have occurred at different times and places, but to propose a date for this development around

² Some of the interlaced fragments remain so far undocumented, as well as a number of morsels in hands clearly different from those mss already published. We will attempt at presenting those as well.

the turn of times would certainly not meet with serious objections. However, this guessed date appears as too recent in the light of the result of a C14 check done 2007 by the Leibniz Institute at the University of Kiel, Germany, under the number KIA32298. It led to a Two Sigma range of 184-046 BC with a probability of 95.4%. Another test by the same Institute on the Prajñāpāramitā ms (KIA26906) led to a date in the more recent half of the first century AD and so there could be a gap measuring a whole century between two mss in the same collection. However, as discussed elsewhere (Falk 2014b: 46f.), C14 dates from South Asian organic material often appear as too remote when compared to estimations based on philological, i.e. non-technological consideration, which has its own innate vagueness.

If we took the C14 frame at face value, our ms would date from *ca.* 100 BC. This may seem acceptable or not, according to personal ideas about the antiquity of some Gandhāran literary genres. So far, one more ms has about the same C14 age, the so-called “Many Buddhas” text now stored at the Library of Congress, with a two sigma range of 206 to 59 BC (Salomon 2018: 397, fn. 364). The hands behind our page A and the “Many Buddhas” are quite different, but there are structural identities, as the still maintained distinction of *na* and *ṇa* and the absence of overbars. In some aspects the Many Buddhas ms appears even more modern when the scribe uses different forms of *sa* for OIA /sa/ and /ssa/. Palaeography can furnish relative sequences of forms, but cannot furnish absolute chronologies, since older forms can survive following personal taste and local habits. We can only state that our collection of *avadānas* shows structural traits that are in line with its being the so far oldest collection of the genre and that neither C14 nor the relative state of the Kharoṣṭhī contradicts this impression.

Further finds will certainly allow to draw more reliable conclusions.

The term avadāna

A great number of *avadānas* have been edited or republished recently, and most authors have lost a word or two on the meaning of the term *avadāna*. Since at least Winternitz (1933: 279f.; Salomon 1999: 37) it is common to expect a “broader sense” of “pious legend” or “great deed” and this view has been variously repeated, *faute de mieux*. Karashima & Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya (2012: 148) summarized comparable contents as “explain[ing] the present-time events of disciples, peoples, *pretas*, animals etc. as well as the Buddha himself in terms of the deeds of their past lives (*karman*)”, all this “written for a story-telling monk”. In fact, these paraphrases describe the contents of the *avadānas* but hardly explain the term as such. If we take the word verbally, we get two possible solutions. One is “snippet, chip, paper shavings” from Skt. *ava-do*, *ava-dyati*. In Vedic parlance, the term *avadāna* is also used for a chip of wood to be thrown into the sacred fires. Second, a homophone arises from Skt. *ava-dai*, *ava-dayati*, “to clean,” and *avadāna* then means a “pure deed, proper behavior,” e.g. in the Arthaśāstra 1.8,16. This latter etymology has drawn all the attention, but we think that the first formation deserves notice as well. We envisage a birch-bark producing workshop cutting sheets of bark into one uniform size, so that the parts can be glued and sewn into one long rectangular body to be rolled up. The raw sheets came from the woods in various sizes with irregular borders. For the roll, lower and upper ends not cut at a right angle or partly torn, will have to be brought to size and parts will have to be cut away, *ava-dyati*,

and such snippets can duly be called *avadāna*. There will be very small snippets, but also larger ones. Even the larger ones will not be large enough for long texts, but they can hold short texts, and very short texts. The early *avadānas* consist of very short texts. On our ms, which is still a collection of originally independent and unrelated texts, some legends cover just one or two lines.

A monastery houses all sorts of monks. The best scribes work the “export quality” text rolls. Other monks may want to note down their ideas too, to fix in writing their own useful notes and anecdotes for themselves or for fellow monks. The daily and, in part, trivial experiences of monks stand in the center of so many texts we call *avadānas*, possibly originally stored on snippets called *avadāna*.³ Seen this way the irritating shortness could have arisen not from a laudable culture of oral literature, but instead the diminutive size of the available birch-bark snippets could have been responsible for the premature end of a poet’s verbosity.

This explanation would make sense also with regard to the local distribution of the first *avadānas*: They are found where birch-bark was in use, but not in the East where palm leaves of more equal size were common and which are not subject to cutting to size, gluing and elongation. As far as we can see, the present collection of eleven useful notes and anecdotes is a rather original collection, culled from individually separate snippets, containing stories that can be re-used by other monks to console or pacify laymen in trouble. When the genre developed, the notes were converted into ordinary lengthy stories also in writing, losing their snippet character – and the meaning of their original cover term was lost.

The proposed etymology would also explain why *avadānas* are scribbled second hand on the short spaces that occasionally remained blank at the end of longer and more important texts (Salomon 1999: 73; 2018: 231), extending the idea of “snippets” to such empty spaces or even empty backsides on otherwise already inscribed rolls, a welcome resort for monks with no access to uninscribed barks.

Standard collections in comparison

The most recent major addition to the texts known as *avadānas* is a seemingly early collection found at Merv, Central Asia, published by Karashima and Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya in 2012. The differences to other collections are many. The British Library Collection (Salomon 1999: *passim*) written in Kharoṣṭhī and dating in part from the 1st and 2nd cent. AD, follows a fixed structure, starting with “thus it is heard” (*evo suyadi*). Some stories have a title based on a major figure or event found in the story, they deal with episodes of the Buddha’s life of which they mention the locality. They end with a circular sign with or without a running number. Some abbreviations indicate to the storyteller where and how to enlarge and broaden the narrative.

Two *avadāna* collections from the Senior Collection with its origins at Bamiyan were published by T. Lenz in 2002 and 2010, one subsumed under *pūrvayoga*, the other under *avadāna*. The genres are related, only the *pūrvayoga* has a link to a time of the past when the Buddha was active in a previous incarnation, comparable to the *atītavatthu* in a Pāli Jātaka. This reference to the past is also part of the collection from Merv, which

³ For the idea as such cf. the famous *Chips from a German Workshop* by Max Müller from 1876.

in addition presents one-word titles drawn from the story that follows.

Apart from *pūrvayoga*, Lenz (2002: 104f.) lists some terms constantly recurring, like *vistare*, telling the monk to expand the narrative free-style from a keyword. Karashima & Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya (2012: 148) found a comparable phrase *vistareṇa vaktavyam* in the Merv collection. The idea of “expansion” of snippets behind the stereotypical *vistareṇa* is crucial to the whole genre. This idea is also expressed once in our text (see below), but the verb used is Skt. *vi-kath* meaning here⁴ and so far exclusively “to relate in detail”, demonstrating again a certain phraseological independence from other traditions.

In addition, there are two features in our text which are absent in the other collections. First, there are two places where the reader is given directives outside the narrative proper as to how he should handle a certain *avadāna*, and these directives do not concern the length of the text, as *vistareṇa* etc. does, but react to a certain situation with certain recipients.

The first directive is found in line A29; it introduces *avadāna* 3: [eso] *padhamo a[bhipra]yo [pravaja]ye*, “The following (*avadāna*) is the first (to cite) in case of an intention to walk away (i.e. to enter the Buddhist order).” Since the text gives advice on how to trick parents into consenting to a boy’s wish to leave his home, this *avadāna* will also be the last to be cited on such an occasion.

The second case is found on side B in line 19, telling how to silence noisy *yavanikā* ladies. The story has nothing Buddhist to it. First we are told that it was one Buddhadeva who used to tell the story. The next sentence presents the personnel, and before any action takes place we learn: *ta ci padhamo katha vikatheatva no amña ca uparito*, “In case that this story is expanded as the first, no other (story should) follow.” The profane nature of the story probably forbade to start teaching serious matter after this clever joke.

Both sentences presuppose that the concerned *avadāna* could be “the first” (*padhamo*), showing that the choice depended on a given situation. The sequence of stories within the collection is haphazard, the situation determines which text will be picked up. There is one directive on side A and the other on side B, and if not inherited from an exemplar it may be indicative of a common idea followed by both clerks, despite their scribal differences.

The second noteworthy feature concerns authorship. In two cases an individual story is introduced as first told by a certain person, and this person does not reoccur in any other contexts: story 9 starts with *budhadevo avadana japati*, story 10 with *uvadiśo avadano japati*. Buddhadeva and Upatiṣya make their appearance only in these titles, showing that the first oral presentation is traced back to their name. That means the stories are named after their authors, who were narrators, not clerks. Nothing like is found in the younger collections.

An *avadāna* story commonly centers around monks living “here” and “today”, with their experiences and insights. In texts written in Kharoṣṭī, “here” would mean in Gandhāra and its backyards. In fact, *avadāna* no. 3 has a boy visit *nagarasamaja*, where we consider taking *nagara* not as just any “town”, but as the particular town *Nagara*, which gave its name to the whole district of *nagarāhāra*, the Nangarhar of today, the

⁴ In Vedic parlance it means “to speak ill of someone.”

valley of the Kabul river east and west of Jalalabad. The chronology of “today” can include references to known kings. In the collection of Lenz (2002: 100) two rulers occur, Jihonika and Aśpavarma, active in Kashmir, Hazara and the Peshawar plain in the second half of the first century AD. This is the upper time limit for when the Split Collection was written or its texts assembled. Since our ms shows signs of being copied (see below) we would expect references to rulers of about a century earlier. In *avadāna* no. 10 we meet a ruler as such, who is impressed by the Buddhist reasoning concerning luxury, but unfortunately there is neither name nor any other datable detail written or preserved. At least we meet a group of party-making *yavanikā* ladies in *avadāna* no. 9, who should belong to the “Westerners”, or rather Indo-Greek, a group of people and mercenaries, who lost their independence with the last century BC.

Most of the *avadānas* in our small collection make good reading from begin to end, as far as they can be reconstructed. They reflect an interaction between clergy and the world of the lay-people. Some of them can very well be compared to the contents of Christian sermon collections, that is texts written by one or more priests for their weekly sermons, in outline or fully formulated. Such sermons need not reflect anything other but the canonical theology, but often they react to temporal or local particularities.

A school affiliation may be found in text no. 8 (B16) which has a Mahāsāṃghika monk act beneficially counteracting malicious Ājīvikas. The verb *jalpati* is used several times transitively in the meaning of “to tell, relate, speak about (something)” (B18, 21, 22, 28). Karashima (2014: 85) has shown that this is a feature found in a number of texts associated with the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins. A vague argument against Sārvāstivādins may be seen in a monk called Sarvanāsti in *avadāna* no. 2 (A19). Since monks were mobile and the communities frequently remixed, the individual texts may go back to notes sketched by many authors, and so the collection *in toto* should not be expected to present only thoughts prevalent in a Mahāsāṃghika orthodoxy.

Palaeography

The scripts show a number of old or conservative traits on sides A and B. Both scribes distinguish between *na* (e.g. *ani* ← *ānīya*, A24) and *ṇa*, the first and dental *na* a long slim S-line, whereas the retroflex *ṇa* comes as a short hook. The application follows the general trend: Both scribes use the hook more than necessary, but the younger B-scribe does it three times more often than the older scribe on the A-page.⁵

Both scribes place the preconsonantal *r*- separately and do not link it in a loop with the stem of the consonant sign. But the A-scribe uses an angular hook (⤠) while the B-scribe has changed the Aśokan hook to the upper half of a circle (⤡). According to the limited corpus used for IndoSkript, the first century AD was a transition zone between hook and full loop. In any case both our forms can be found in the first centuries BC and AD, while only the hook is the Aśokan base form, yet by some still upheld into Kushan times.

Not singularly found here, but rare is the underdotted *ma*. In this edition it is transcribed as *ma*, as in A18 *masuvasithen[a]*, B16 *mahasamghigo*, B17 *ma* (Skt. *mā*). The underdotting arose with coin designers in the Indo-Greek period with the intention

⁵. The relations of A:B are: *na* correct 45:28 times; *na* false 1:0; *ṇa* correct 8:7; *ṇa* false 12:29.

to graphically mark the beginning of the circular legend around the reverse side always starting with *maharajasa* where both *ma* and *ha* have underdots. This habit has found various receptions and on coins has gone out of use on a large scale around the middle of the rule of Maues, around 60 BC. Among the last to use the dots were Artemidorus and Archebios, both immediate predecessors of Maues, and Telephos and Azes, both overlapping with Maues' times. Since celators and Buddhist monks lived in different worlds it may not be advisable to use these dots in mss for dating purposes. It may not be by chance that the purpose on coins coincides with the use in our ms, i.e. to mark the beginning of a word. In the younger Helagupta plates, dated AD 74, the under-dotted *ma* is found three times, of which two occur in the middle of a word (Falk 2014a: 20). Even later, around AD 300, a scribe working at Loralai on the middle Indus used the dots too, without distinction for both initial (2) and medial (2) positions of the *ma* (Falk 2021b: 135a).

So far, the most noteworthy trait exhibited by clerk A is the use of an overdotted *kṣa*. It is found only on the front side, in *kṣovati* (A6), twice in *śikṣanaye* (A15), *prakṣalidehi* (A26), and in *bhikṣahi* (A33). This dot seems to make clear that this letter is not a *mo* for which it could be mistaken, but younger monks apparently have given up this clarifying device. At least we are unaware of other occurrences of overdotted forms of *kṣa* from birch-bark mss, but it is occasionally found on coins of Nahapāna (r. ca. AD 20-70) in the term *kṣaharata* (cf. table in Scott 1904-8: 233).

Copy or autograph?

T. Lenz (2002: 102) was of the impression that the text productions labeled *pūrvayoga* and *avadāna* received rather little respect within a monastery, and so he took his material to be rather the work of one individual author, whose product was not considered worthy enough for being copied by others. This explanation appears credible for the period of Lenz's material, but our text is at least different with regard to the copying process.

Birch-bark splits horizontally, so that letters can be divided in their middle. When the lower or upper part of a sheet gets lost the copyist may draw the wrong conclusions when trying to supplement the missing half of a line. Mistakes explicable through split lines are found in *chativano* for *chavivano* in A22, and in parts of a stanza found also in other texts where in *anvavati* (A10) from P. *anvakārīt*, first the *ka* turned to *va*, as the lower part apparently was lost, then the *ri* turned *ti* for the same reason. In the same stanza *apa* stands for Skt. *asim* where with the lower part of the *sa* missing the *i*-stroke was taken for the vertical of a *pa*.

In A17 *nuḍati* should stand for *nujati*, Skt. *nudyate*. Both letters *da* and *ja* were frequently mistaken one for the other until the underbar attached to the right of the *da* put an end to the homomorphy. Misreading intermediate forms of *ja* and *da* is easily done by a copyist, but an original author would hardly have miswritten what he had formulated himself.

Another mistake occurs more often. The wavy *na* and the S-shaped *da* can look rather similar. In A32 we read an unmistakable *nutiyaka*, instead of *dutiyaka*, for Skt. *dvitīyakan̄*. In A28 *nikeda* the *da* is overwritten for *nikena*, and it stands to reason that the exemplar had *nikedana*, Skt. *niketana*. Younger texts eliminate such *na-da*-mistakes by using the hooked long *na* for spoken *na* and *na* and the S-curved *da* in diminished size.

Taken together these cases make a copy much more likely than an autograph. But a copy may be enlarged by ad hoc composed sentences or stories, turning a copyist into an author. Telling from the careless and atypical hand found in the very last two lines on side B we can imagine that this last *avadāna* was added by yet another scribe. This last part mentions the *ugamo budho*, known otherwise as the Tathāgata Udgama. “Otherwise” refers to just one text, the Bhadrakalpikasūtra, a classical Mahāyāna text, listing hundreds of Buddhas. Its genesis and development is still open to scrutiny (Baums, Glass and Matsuda 2016: 185), but this addition could be another case of so-called mahāyānistic traits in the first century AD, at the latest.

Remarkable contents

Monks going for food

In story 3 a boy meets representatives of a monastery at a public festival and is fed. The food received tastes much better than the food he is used to from home. He decides to leave his parents for this reason but needs their permission to enter the clergy. With a trick he has his mother say “*gaccha*” and takes this as a sign of agreement. Spiritual ambitions on the side of the novices are not expected by those recruiting young monks. The *avadāna* teaching tricky half-truth is said to be told to adepts. Verbal honesty is not required nor recommended.

In story 7 it is a *kulopaka*, a monk particularly bound to a certain house, who is looked down upon by a serious *śramaṇa* because all the *lābha* the housemonk wants is good food, preferably cooked with honey and garlic.

In story 2 the old man to be burned considers that without his activities the monks at the rains station will suffer from less or no salt and vegetables.

Hunger has made many a poor child to join the Buddhist order, both in the past and present.

Self-immolation

This random collection of useful advice includes aspects of monastic life which were not dealt with in the locally observed *vinaya*. Its advice could even contradict traditional rules. In Alexander’s time, e.g., self-immolation of non-Buddhist *śramaṇas* was not an exceptional event. Unaccustomed to such behavior the conqueror invited one of these “philosophers” to accompany himself on his way home west. The Buddha does not deal with this habit in his teachings preserved in Pāli, and possibly self-immolation was rather a pre-Buddhist North-Western custom and unknown in Bihar. Our *avadāna* no. 2 tells us how one elderly *antevāsin* layman was made to be burned on a pyre and thus pass into *parinirvāṇa* (sic), bypassing all stages of monastic hierarchy. The idea was not his at all, but obviously he was not given the chance to say no. Self-immolation as an idea seems to have been exported to Buddhist circles in China where evidence is manifold, as manifold as the arguments against such practices, found collected in the travel report of Yi-jing 義淨 covering events in India from AD 673 onward (cf. below p. 37f.).

Magic seals

The use of stamp seals, commonly with incised letters or symbols is also remarkable. They can serve as amulets and as such one appears in *avadāna* no. 8 against malicious

and non-Buddhist agents. The practice found its standard form in Hellenistic times and its application by monks may be regarded as due to western influence on Gandhāra.

Notable vocabulary

a) *seriyaputra*

The farmer, *seriyaputra*, occurs in our *avadāna* no. 1. The word is a *tadbhava* to *sairikaputra*, of which the first part *sairika* is known from Pāṇini 4.3,124 *halasīrāṭ ṭhak*, further from the *Amarakośa* (2.8.1302) and means “busy with the plough (*sīra*)”. Wojtilla (n.d.) adds more cases from the *kṛśīśāstra*. A Gandhāran *seriyaputra* could then be a hereditary farmer.

Outside Gandhāra, the feminine variant *seriyā* or *seliyā* is relatively frequent, found as a matronym at Bharhut (no. A100) where we read *seriyāputasa bharanidevasa dānam*, where *seriyā* was taken by Lüders, Waldschmidt & Mehendale (1963: 32) as the personal name of a lady *serī*, Skt. *śrī*. At Bhita, Marshall (1915: 44) found an inscription “of about the 2nd century B.C.” of one Gomitra specified as *seliyāputra*. On a (lost) pillar from Kauśāmbī (Sircar 1943: 45) three generations of men are mentioned, all *gahapatis*, one of them Kusapāla, who appears specified as *vārisaputa* and *seliyāputa*, “son of Vārisa, son of *seliyā*”. It seems that *seliyā* and *seriyā* denote a farmer woman rather than a personal name or a *gotra*.

The Pāṇinian form *sairika* seems to have produced the Pkt. fem. *seliyā*, which itself could have led to a m. form **selaya* or *selaka*, the latter found once in the Mvu (2: 199) in the line: *udagro asi tvam rājñāḥ aśvaroho va selako*, addressing the Buddha. So far *selako* has been taken as “untranslatable” (Jones: 190) or as a personal name (BHSD: 605). But if meant in the sense of *sailika* the line would say “Higher are you positioned than a king, (higher than other farmers) like a ploughman riding a horse.”

b) *moha* vs. *mokṣa*

In A23 we encounter a “liberation festival” *muhasakaro*, Skt. *mokṣasatkāra*, and *muha* occurs where *mokṣa*, *mokha* or *moha* is expected. The reverse exchange seems to be more frequent when *mokha* is found where delusion (*moha*) is meant. In addition to the example listed in CKI s.v. *moha*, we can cite a tiny unpublished fragment received with the Split mss reading *mokṣaduhami nirvāṇasuhami* relating to Skt. *mohaduhkha* and *nirvāṇasukha*, the latter also found in the *Lalitavistara*.

c) *ha* and Vedic features

A particle *ha* – not *ho* or *hu* – following a pronoun is not customary in Gāndhārī, and is rare too in Sanskrit. *etaddha vai* is the standard form in Vedic Brāhmaṇas, only the Śatapatha in some sections uses *etaddha* without a further particle. The *ha* is inserted in our text at A8 as a word of its own too in the meaning of *vinigraha*, antithesis, as defined by Yāska in Nirukta 1,5, and so we can assume to meet a Vedic particle here, not surprising in the area of Gandhāra.

The Skt. root *cṛt* “to tie” with prefix *ni-* describes the process of “unharnessing”. This verb is so far only attested in the Aitareyabrahmaṇa 8.22.5 in the absolute *niścṛtya* denoting the removal of horses from the yoke. This dissolution of ties would tally nicely with the story of a boy wanting to shake off the bonds of his family. In A31 the verb is

written as *nichiṇiṣi*, which we equate with Skt. *niścartṣyāmi.

A6 reads *kṣovati*, “he is frightened”, which could be Vedic (ChUp 3.5,3) *kṣobhate* or Skt. 4.cl. *kṣubhyati*.

In A26 we find a causative imperative [ka]ra [pra]kṣa[li]etu (Skt. *karau prakṣālayatu*), “he must be made to wash his hands”. The only comparison we see is Āpastambagṛhya 1.24,10 *pādau prakṣālāpayīta*, “he should be made to wash his feet.”

None of these terms appears on the verso. However, there we find the prefix *ava* combined with root *muṣ*, “to steal”. It is so far only found once in the Kāthakam (23.5, II,80:15) of the Black Yajurveda, traditionally located in the North-West. In our text it occurs in line B17 *avamuṣeya*.

Conventions

- [ka] : Letter(s) recognizable, but imperfectly preserved.
- (*ka) : Traces remain, but the letter cannot reasonably be defined and the emendation is to be taken with care.
- «ka» : Letter added above the line in a relevant position or between relevant letters.
- ⟨ka⟩ : Letters only visible on early photographs, fragments not fixed to the glass frames.
- _ : Bark existing, but left uninscribed, rarely as a word divider, often to bypass damaged ground.
- + : One letter’s worth of bark lacking.
- /// : missing bark of incalculable length.
- (x/y) : The reading could be x or y.
- : as in “k.” or “·a”; missing or illegible part of a letter, either consonant or vowel indicator.
- : Small central dot, ending sentences or indicating rhetorical pause, with few exceptions (B13, 25) only on side A.
- : Large open circle, ending sentences, only on side B.
- ❀ : Rosette of smaller circles, marking end of *avadāna* on side A.
- ✿ : Eight-spoked wheel, marking end of *avadāna* on side B.

The eleven stories

The presentation below aims at an elucidation of a number of difficulties we had to face during the editorial process, starting with the physical rearrangement of the birch-bark fragments which posed more problems than any other ms of the Split collection. The comprehension of the stories was impeded by the absence of any sort of parallel. We present here the result of years of work and hopeful that some readers will be able to correct our results at places. Our results are presented in a synoptic way with the readings in the top line underlaid by their Sanskrit *chāyā*, a process which makes syntax and grammar apparent without requiring lengthy explanations. Standard Sanskrit is used for the *chāyā*, even where Pāli or BHS are closer in form. Often one Khar. form could be equated with two or more Skt. renderings; we chose the one that appeared to us as the most likely without discussing other possibilities, simply for reasons of conciseness. Where thought necessary, explanations follow below the translation in smaller type concerning lexical or semantic particularities. All discussions relating to scribal

uncertainties are relegated to the footnotes.

We will introduce most of the *avadānas* with a short characterization of the content, as we understand it. According to our understanding, some of the stories present details concerning every-day life in the monasteries and have little to do with the philosophical side of Buddhism. In some cases, the contents even contradict Vinaya rules.

1. The robber and the ploughman

This *avadāna* is in part adapted from the Aṅgulimāla story which is one of the best-known narratives in early Pāli didactic texts, met with in a number of translations and adaptations. In the standard narrative the Buddha accepts a brahmin robber called Aṅgulimāla into the order, demonstrating that the fruit of bad *karma* can be overcome in this life through strict adherence to the Buddha's rules. The known versions are found compared and the differences meticulously analyzed in Anālayo (2011: 485-502). Our text differs in a number of aspects, the most important one being that the Buddha is absent from the story including the initial miraculous "speed walking". This may be due to the basic idea behind *avadānas*, namely, that they have to deal with monks and not with the Buddha. Instead of the speed-walking we get an element from the Divyāvadāna (456: 16ff.) where the king cannot shoot a woman because of her practicing *maitrī*, on account of which the flight of his arrow is interrupted. In our case the plowman thinks of turning into a woman to become unassailable, a motive of which not all details are clear. In any case, this frustrating event makes the robber discard his weapons, Aṅgulimāla style, and seek tutorial with the Buddhist clergy. Then, out of the blue, Madhuvāsiṣṭha,⁶ a Buddhist teacher, enters and takes the Buddha's part in educating the former robber.

The text is more than just a few scanty notes; it is fully written out and of a didactic nature, showing that bad deeds can still be overcome (even without a Buddha around) and that *maitrī* not only helps abandoning this world, but is also useful in defense or warfare. The mechanics of a *satyagraha*, proposed for application by the Buddha to Aṅgulimāla in MN ii,103, appear in our version only nominally as a plain statement (Skt) *satyam asty eṣā vidyā*, without exemplification.

In short: Buddhist monks can direct a former criminal to the same sort of salvation as did the Buddha.

(A1:) ///

(A2:) + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + [ba]⁷[1]o mahabhayanako •
mahābhayānakah

" . . . he is very dangerous."

(A3:) + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + [so] ya seriyaputro tato proṣi
so ca sairikaputraḥ tatra prāvātsū

" . . . and the ploughman stayed out there."

gra (A4:) mogato p· ..⁸ + + + + + + + + pratabho[caṇa] •
grāmagataḥ . . . prātarbhojanam

⁶ The story of Madhuvāsiṣṭha is told in the Samghabhedavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya (Gnoli 1977/78, II: 47), the numerous parallels mainly in Chinese literature are listed by Lamotte (1970: 1659, fn. 3). Madhuvāsiṣṭha was a monkey in his previous life and insisted on treating the Buddha with freshly fetched honey. He died while retreating by falling into a hole. He was re-born as son of a brahmin in Nādikā and on the day of his conception and his birth honey rained down to earth. He later became a Buddhist monk. Nothing of this has any repercussion in or connection with our text.

⁷ The [ba] may not be *ba*, however, a *ma* (from *aṅgulimāla*) is excluded.

⁸ This fragment has no direct link with any other, but clearly stood at the right side border. The fragment below also shows bark wrinkles. In addition it adds ^o*mo* to a preceding *gra*^o.

“He went to the village (?) . . . breakfast.”

so a[ti]vika[lo] (*pra)[t̪hi]to pādalipu[tr]o

so ativikālam prasthitah pāṭaliputram

“Much too late did he take off for Pāṭaliputra.”

[?sa ya] (A5:) . . . e[ta]

Truncated beyond recovery, probably a reference to “in the evening” (*sāyam*).

so [ya] tatra bahi nakara[sa tena c]o⁹_rena_ paripra[to] •

so ca tatra bahir nagarasya tena coreṇa pariprāptah

“And there, he encountered a robber at the outskirts of the city.”

We take *pariprāpta* in the sense of *prāpta*. Obviously, the city gates were already closed, possibly an undesired state resulting from having taken the breakfast too late.

so dhanukalavosanahita •

so dhanu-kalāpa-saṁnāhitah

“The (robber) was girded with bow and quiver.”

Also in the Aṅgulimāla-Sutta (MN 86: ii. 97-105) the gruesome robber is said to be *dhanukalāpam sannayhitvā* before he starts menacing the Buddha. The phrase is frequently used in descriptions of criminals and soldiers.

(A6:) tasa kṣo¹⁰vati

tathā kṣobhate

“Then the (ploughman) got frightened.”

so seriyaputro pa_śati • ki istri śaka katu • ti

so sairikaputraḥ paśyati. kiṇi striyam śakyam kartum iti

“The ploughman reflected: ‘What would a woman be able to do?’”

This question is inspired by the encounter described in the *Divyāvadāna*, cf. below.

so met(ra) samavano_

so maitrīm samāpannah

“The (plowman) produced loving kindness.”

The expression finds an explanation in the statement in the Milindapañha (PTS ed.: 199): *yasmin mahārāja khaṇe puggalo mettaṇam samāpanno hoti na tassa puggalassa tasmiṇi khaṇe aggi vā visam vā sattham vā kamati, tassa ye keci ahitakāmā upagantvā tam na passanti, tasmiṇi okāsam na labhanti*, “At the moment, O king, in which an individual has *realized the sense of love*, that moment neither fire, nor poison, nor sword can do him harm. If any man bent on doing him an injury come up, they will not see him, neither will they have a chance of hurting him.” (T.W. Rhys Davids, 1890: 281). In the *Divyāvadāna* 456:16ff, a king tries to shoot a Buddhist queen along with her servant women. The queen ordered all of them to exercise *maitrī* (*sarvā yūyam maitrīm samāpadyadhvam iti*). As a result the first arrows dropped midway, the second even returned to the king. In the MSV *śayāsanavastu* (SBV I, 115; A385a) a Bodhisattva exercises *maitrī* and turns all weapons aimed at him into flowers.

⁹. The letter *co* is severely distorted and provisionally restored.

¹⁰. The overdotted *kṣa* in combination with the -o-stroke looks similar to *kṣi*.

(A7:) tena kada osriṭha •

tena kāndam avasrstam

“(The robber) shot an arrow.”

Truncated beyond recovery.

It is unclear whether this segment was once glued to the following bark, which starts with an uninscribed part used for gluing. The flow of the story seems to support this sequence.

(A8:) + aha aha smi eva balavato mahanago • šuro ya [ti]

āha aham asmi evam balavān mahānāgah. śūraḥ ca iti

... “(The ploughman) said: ‘I am likewise a mighty ‘big elephant’ and a hero.’”

On Skt. *-vant*-stems in G. *-ato* for the nominative cf. Silverlock 2015: 331, fn. 836; Lenz forthc. line 4.253 with commentary. The sequence *mahānāgā* + *sūrā* is frequent in AN and DN in lists naming the parts of an army. A different sequence of closely related terms is found in the MSV-Samghabhedavastu in *sūrāḥ praskandināḥ mahānagnāḥ*. A person called Mahānāga is known from the Paramatthadīpanī (PTS p. 166) on Theragāthā 387-392 where it is said that he was born in Sāketa as son of the brahmin Madhvāśeṭṭha, without any reference to the honey episode connected to his father's name. Possibly this son associated with *mahanaga* was the reason to insert the father Madhvāśeṭṭha further down in this story.

eta «ha» vijaṭhanalabha [(mo/ja/kṣa) n· ta sa yo] (A9:) .. [ta]to

etad ha vidyāsthānalābhām . . .

“(There) in addition is this acquisition of knowledge”

The *ha* has been inserted as an afterthought or *secunda mano* in a very small form between *ta* and *vi*, possibly in the sense of *vinigraha* (Nirukta 1,5) to stress the difference between the robber who commands only over physical force and the mental force of the plowman. Cf. Intro on *ha* (pp. 29–30 above).

ya(trā+ka) kađu na nivatati •

yat kāndam enam nivartati

“... that the arrow returns to him,” (and so it happened.)

The second letter is *tra*, overwritten *s.m.* by a *ka* in thinner outline, possibly to invalidate the *tra*. We take the first *na* as the acc. pronoun *nam* (cf. A22 for a further case), since the *maitrī* results in the arrow not reaching its aim and returning to the sender, at least in the Divyāvadāna story (*sa [śarah] nivartya rājñāḥ samīpe patitah*).

tato dani aha ekachatraye padhaviye raya¹¹ bhaviše siya

tataḥ idānīm āha ekacchatrāyām prthivyām rājā bhavisye syām

“Then he said: ‘In the future, I will be king on earth exercising one (single) authority’.”

The “earth under one authority” is also expressed in the Bower ms (4, fol. 3, 4: *ekacchatrām mahīm kṛtsnām rājā ... bhokṣyase*; also the future Buddha in *DivyAv* (230:20): *anenāham kuśalamūlena ekacchatrāyām prthivyām rājā syām*.

sayeva agudi_ (A10:) + + + + .. sagrato

*sa eva anguli(*mālah) . . . sāgrataḥ*

“The very Āṅgulimāla . . . completely.”

We take **sāgratas* as synonymous with *samagratas* which is found in BHS.

11. In *rayo* an *-o*-stroke was wiped out for *raya*.

tatreva coro apa avisa ca • śvabhrapravate narake anvavati
tatraiva coraḥ asim āyudhañ ca śvabhrapravāte narake anvakārī

“At this very moment the robber cast his sword and weapons into a hell with cliffs and clefts.”

This line shows that the change in the robber only repeats what happened to Aṅgulimāla before. Fortunately, a number of parallels (MN II,100 *itveva coro asim āyudhañ ca sobbhe papāte narake anvakārī*, ThG 869, *anvakāsi*) enable a reconstruction. The change from *asi* to *apa* shows that the *i*-stroke was still present in the exemplar, while the lower part of the *sa* must have gone missing. – A similar misreading based on the missing lower part of some letters explains how the closing letters *kari* could be misread and miscopied as *vati*. On P. *anvakāri* vs. *anvakāsi* cf. CPD s.v. *anukirati*. Our line does not allow us to define to which tradition the source belonged to, as both *ri* and *si* truncated in their lower part could lead to the misreading *ti* in our stanza. The small circle dividing the line shows that a metrical original was followed which obeyed the rules of the *trīṣṭubh* rather perfectly.

eva so saī śastrabha[ḍ·]

evam so svayam śastrabhāñda . . .

“In the same way the (robber) himself (threw away) his lot of weapons . . .”

The robber copies the behavior of the legendary Aṅgulimāla and so this line seems to prove that Aṅgulimāla is not personally acting within our narrative.

(A11:) + + + + + + + [t][o/i][ḍh/th·][ch/s/ph]· . . . + + + + ye •

No reconstruction possible.

yena eda śastra na kramati

yena etat śatram na kramati

“. . . so that this weapon does not pierce.”

(A12:) [vaśitavaśa] śikṣami

. śikṣāmi

“. I will teach.”

Although most letters look recognizable, we cannot explain *vaśitavaśa*.

e[hi pre]na ta sace vadea ca

ehi prenva tam, satyam vadeyam ca

“Come, send him, and I will tell the truth.”

[śikṣaga] śa aha bāḍho ti

śikṣakah āha bāḍham iti

“The (prospective) student . . . said: ‘Certainly’.”

tato masu(A13:)[va]siṭhasa [ayiṣa]to ekato nito •

tataḥ madhuvāsiṣṭhasya āyuṣmataḥ ekāntam nītah

“Then he was led into the presence of the venerable Madhuvāsiṣṭha.”

tena paḍhamo masiśviṭho¹² grahito

tena prathamam madhuvāsiṣṭhah gṛhitah

“The (robber) first held on to/touched Madhuvāsiṣṭha.”

ayiṣva • eso khu eva bhayanako

āyuṣman eṣaḥ khalu eva bhayānakah

“(Someone said:) ‘Venerable Sir! They say that this man is dangerous’.”

tasa ayi(A14:)ṣva •

tathā āyuṣman

“(Madhuvāsiṣṭha said:) ‘So be it, Venerable Sir’.”

brohi saca asti eṣa vija ti

brūhi satyam asti eṣā vidyā iti

“(The Ācārya said:) ‘Tell (him) that this science means truth’.”

śikṣaviṣe ti aha baḍho

śikṣāpiṣye iti āha bāḍham

“(Madhuvāsiṣṭha) said: ‘I will teach (him), certainly’.”

tato so coro tatraviṣvata uvakalito •

tataḥ so coraḥ tatra āyuṣmatā upakalitaḥ

“Then the robber was prompted by the Venerable in that matter.”

Skt. *upa-kal* is so far unattested, which we propose to take in the meaning of simple *kalayati*, *kalita*, ‘to impel, incite, urge on’.

s[o] aha i[cha](A15:)mi eta śipavijaṭhana śikṣanaye¹³

so āha icchāmi etat śilpavidyāsthānam śikṣanāyai

“(The robber) said: ‘I wish the handicraft science for my study-field’.”

This seems to illustrate the naiveté of the robber, as he can only think of handicraft as a science, while for monks *śilpa* is not a teaching matter. Cf. Vinayasūtra 17.435 *na śilpam anutiṣṭhet*; LaṅkāvatāraS 10,333 *śilpavidyām na śikṣeta*.

tat[r]ayiṣva [a]ha tisa s[a]ca sti¹⁴ eṣa vijaṭhana śikṣanayu¹⁵ .

tatra āyuṣmān āha tridhā satyam asti etad vidyāsthānam śikṣanāyai

“Then the Venerable (Madhuvāsiṣṭha) said: ‘Threefold is this science as a study-field’.”

Three items make the tenets of Aṅgulimāla in the MN (ii, 105), who calls them the three sciences, (*tisso vijjā anuppattā*). They seem to be hidden in the stanzas before, *saranagamanam*, *appamādām* and meditation (*jhāyanto*), or *appamādām*, *kusalam* and *buddhasāsana*.

¹². The name of Madhuvāsiṣṭha has been heavily miscopied. The *i*-stroke probably resulted from the now lost *va*. The *ś* for *s* in *vāsiṣṭha*/*vaśiṣṭha* is a common variant also in Sanskrit texts. The distorted reading was explained by S. Karashima during a reading session.

¹³. Here and in the next line the *kṣa* shows an intentionally placed tiny dot inside its upper bend, certainly not a short *-e*-stroke, probably to distinguish *kṣa* from the similarly looking *mo*.

¹⁴. An initial *a*- was forgotten before *sti*.

¹⁵. The *-u*-bend ends in a long downward stroke, miscopied from *yi* ?

tatrayiṣra¹⁶ aha sa(A16:)[ca] asti eṣa [vija] •

tatra āyuṣmān āha satyam asti eṣā vidyā

“Then the Venerable said: ‘This science means truth’.”

The topic as such arose through the *satyakriyā* (Anālayo 2011: 498, fn. 282) as told in the MN. Here, the contents of this moment are wholly ignored. On the recent importance of the Āṅgulimālaparitta cf. Malalasekara (1937: 23).

tatra [sa k·dh·

tatra sa kathām

“At this point the (robber said): ‘How?’”

t]o vatitavo bhuti •

tad vartitavyam bhavati

“(Madhuvāsiṣṭha answered:) ‘It has to be put in motion’.”

aha [kadha

āha kathām

“(The robber) said: ‘How?’”

a]ha pravacitavo •

āha pravrajitavyah

“(The Venerable Madhuvāsiṣṭha) said: ‘(First,) you have to leave your home.’”

This is the first of three topics, all relating to *saraṇāgamanam*, one of the three *vidyās* in the MN. The number is maintained, the content simplified.

keśa orovitava •

keśāḥ avaropitavyāḥ

“(Second,) the hair has to be shaved,”

kaṣaka punu utava sarvadra(A17:) + + +

kāṣāyam punar ūtavyam sarvatra . . .

“(Third,) in addition a rust-coloured cloth has to be sewn (and put on) everywhere’.”

+ + + + + + + uvat[i]ṭha pravayi • uvasapatito •

upadīṣṭah prāvrajīt. upasampāditah

“. . . Instructed (this way the robber) left his home and was ordained.”

tatrayiṣvata metra upatiṣṭha •

tatra āyuṣmatā maitrīm upadīṣṭām

“Then the Venerable taught (him) friendliness.”

yata apanudakena nuḍati¹⁷ na pravi(A18:) .. + + + + [pati] •

yataḥ apanodakena nudyate na pravi . . .

¹⁶. We take the *ṣra* as a miswritten or miscopied *ṣva* with no lexical relevance.

¹⁷. The change from *dy* → *d* appears unlikely and we expect a miscopy of the regular *j*.

“So that when he is brushed aside by someone (he will) not . . . (and . . .)”

The reading hardly admits alternatives, but word boundaries may be set differently. In the MN ii, 104 the monk Aṅgulimāla is heavily assaulted by the citizens of Śrāvastī in retaliation for his earlier misdeeds. The Buddha advises him to accept the treatment (*adhibāsehi tvam*), as forbearance could relieve him in no time of his bad *karma*. The term *mettā/maitrī* is not used in the MN prototype, where, however, *mettā* is drastically described in MN i, 129, denoting the unreserved friendliness towards robbers while they saw their victims to pieces.

ara(a→ha) bhusi

arhan abhūt

“(The robber) became an arhat.”

This is a standard trait of the Aṅgulimāla narrative (MN ii, 104).

abhiutarita roca a[bh]u[ṣi] •

abhyuttaritvā rocaḥ abhūt

“After crossing (to yonder world) he became a light (in the sky).”

Becoming a heavenly body seems to be a notion of the North-West, as also the Vajrapāṇi-like Yakṣa in the “Miracle at Śrāvastī” of the Split Collection (Falk & Steinbrückner 2020: 37, B35) was placed in the sky.

[api] seriyaputrena api ḡasuvasiṣṭhen[a] •

api seriyaputreṇa api madhuvāsiṣṭheṇa

“What happened to the ploughman, what happened to Madhuvāsiṣṭha?”

tayeva vaṣavaso

tau eva varṣavāsau

“These two spent the rainy season together.”

(A19:) seriya[p]u[tro pravaya]ti •

seriyaputraḥ pravrajati

“The plowman (also) became a monk.”

2. Self-immolation of the *antevāsin* Bāhulaka

This *avadāna* is most remarkable as it describes the more or less voluntary self-immolation of an inmate of a monastery. The initiative came from the group of monks and supporters present at the monsoon station. The six monks of differing extractions are presented by their names, and they hold the idea that such a self-immolation leads to *parinirvāṇa*, even if the candidate has not achieved much with regard to understanding Buddhist tenets. They chose an old man among themselves as he was thought to die anyway soon. They expect him not only to reach *nirvāṇa*, they also think he will become a Buddha with a particular luminous appearance. Their zeal seems to imply the idea that this Buddha-to-be will also be able to positively influence their own life.

No such description of a monastic self-immolation has reached us so far from the Indian sphere. Much has been written about similar events in Chinese Buddhist circles, with the first cases documented from the Jin 晉 dynasty (AD 265-420; Gernet 1960: 531; Benn 2007: 203), that is at a time when monks from Gandhāra had started to visit Xinjiang and monks from China kept visiting Gandhāran monasteries. Our text documents such a self-immolation not only some centuries earlier, but also suggests that the origins are found in Gandhāra.¹⁸ From there it took quite a while before in India proper self-immolation is

¹⁸ Gernet (1960: 541f.) had an Indian literary origin in view which only in China was turned into a ritual.

discussed, not by Indians, but by the Chinese traveling monk Yi-jing 義淨 (Takakusu 1896: 195-8, Li 2000: 163-7) in the 7th cent. AD, who seems to have his fellow countrymen in view as readers when he condemns self-immolation and the scorching of fingers and arms. In Indian sources such practises are almost absent, lauded only in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, Chapter 22, where Bodhisattvas burn themselves on pyres (*adhiṣṭhāna, mañca*) in veneration of the Tathāgata in order to enter *parinirvāṇa*, in continuation of an idea that our *avādāna* presupposes.

The story shows to laypeople that not the slightest knowledge of Buddhist tenets is necessary to achieve *parinirvāṇa*. Local monks seem to cherish the idea that such a burned person can exert his influence to better the life of their former company left back on earth.

arañño saghamitro (sa+ya)¹⁹śamaso dhamarakṣito tritio ca

aranyaḥ samghamitraḥ sāśramasad dharmarakṣitah trītyah ca

a: “Araṇya, the co-hermit (*sāśramasad*) Saṅghamitra and Dharmarakṣita as the third.”

b: “Araṇya and Saṅghamitra, and the hermit (*ca śramana*) Dharmarakṣita as the third.”

amoheṇa sarvanasti pacimo ♫

amogheṇa sarvanāsti pañcamah

“With Amogha (as the fourth) was Sarvanāsti the fifth.”

Sarvanāsti probably is descriptive marking the monk as an opponent to the *sarvāstivāda*.

(A20:) ṣaṭhi śaga[de ca e]kena vaṣena •

ṣaṭṭah śakaṭah ca ekena varṣena

“And Śakaṭa was the sixth, for one year.”

śagaḍa we take as a name derived from the constellation *śakata*, attested as a proper name (MW).

[ba]holako [sa]hi ca vaṣehi [v/dh- v]e [t]i [t/so] kṣemeṇa ca

bāhulakah ṣadbhīḥ ca varṣaiḥ . . . kṣemeṇa ca

“And Bāhulaka (lived with them) for six rainy seasons, . . . and in peace.”

The name could also be an epithet, cf. *bāhulika* in the Bhikṣuṇīvinaya, Mvu etc., meaning ‘gluttonous’ (BHSD). It is tempting to read °vaṣehi vasati, but our “v]e” certainly is no *sa*.

atra gahi[k]eṇa dhamagutena ca •

atra ḡṛhikena dharmaguptena ca

“With them there was also the housekeeper Dharmagupta.”

A *gahika* certainly is no *gahapati/ṛghapati*, “estate holder”, he could be a *ṛghin*, “householder”, at least Dharmagupta has a female student (*upasthāyikā*) with him (cf. below). On married monks cf. von Hinüber (2000: 82f. = KlSchr II: 1053f.).

(A21:) vuḍhataro •

vrddhatarah.

“He was older (than the rest).”

¹⁹ The overwriting started with *saśamaso*, which could be Skt. *sāśramasad*, a “co-hermit”. The overwritten *ya* if meant for *ca* makes it clear that *arañño* must be a personal name and not a locality. It is not clear which of the two versions is the original one.

ta ede dham²⁰mag[u]a²¹ jarata ahas[u]

tad ete dharmaguptam jārataḥ āhuḥ

“This being so, they spoke to Dharmagupta about old age:”

baholago [dha]maguta[sa amte]vaso •

bāhulakah dharmaguptakasya antevāśī

“Bāhulaka is the serving house-pupil of Dharmagupta.”

As an *antevāśin* Bāhulaka needs not be ordained and appears thus as a layman.

ya te [buho]lago aja pa(A22:)riṇivahi[ṣati

yad te bāhulakah adya parinirvahisyatī

“In case your Bāhulaka would go to Parinirvāṇa today, . . .”

t]o no sahasa pariśudho chativāṇo²² abhoṣi

tad nah sahasā pariśuddhah chavivarṇah abhūt

“. . . then for us he would suddenly become a fully pure and white-skinned (Buddha-like) figure.”

pariśuddhah chavivarṇah is a stock phrase to describe the complexion of the Buddha on two occasions, first at his awakening and in the night of his *parinirvāṇa* (DN ii,134).

tada uvaṭhayaga na prachadi

tadā upasthāyikā enām pṛcchati

“Then his female student asked (Dharmagupta):”

According to the Bhikṣuṇīvinaya 218, an *upasthāyikā* has a necessarily male preceptor and as such is an *upādhyāyinī*. The Gāndhārī spelling here looks like a masculine form, but the address *putriṇī* below leaves no choice.

bhade ativaiyīṣvato (A23:) muhasa[karo]

bhante atīvāyuṣmataḥ mokṣasatkārah

“Honorable man; is there a liberation ceremony for exceedingly old people?”

For *bhante* used for superiors, and *āyuṣmat/āvusa/ayiṣpa* for monks lower in rank cf. Kieffer-Pülz 2016: 96. – On *muha* s. above “Notable vocabulary.” (p. 29 above)

[aha] putriṇi • yasa du[khakam]dhasa purimakoḍi ḡa ñaiti •

āha putriṇi yasya duḥkhaskandhasya pūrvakoṭīḥ na jñāyate

“He said: ‘Lady with sons; for someone who does not know (even) the basic prerequisites about (the liberation from) the constituents of suffering . . .’

purimakoḍi relates to *pūrvakoṭī* as does *purimaga* to *paurvaka* in the Gāndhārī Prajñāpāramitā (Falk & Karashima 2013: 152, 162). These prerequisites in most cases are linked to *saṃsāra*, which is based on *avidyā*, which is the first of the constituents of suffering (*duḥkhaskandha*). Thus, our glutinous *antevāśin* is characterized as devoid of even the basic insights.

²⁰. This pivotal term preserves a rare case of *anusvāra*-bend.

²¹. The -*gua* of *dhaṇmagua* can be compared to *uaka*, Skt. *guptaka* and *m-uya*, Skt. *dharmaguptaka* (Falk 2021a: 13).

²². Again the lower part of some letters seems to have been missing, leading from *chavivāṇo* to *chativāṇo*.

tasa aja a[na]viśiṣonikṣe[vo bhavi]ṣati
tasya adya anavaśeṣanikṣepaḥ bhaviṣyati

“... such a man will today experience (his own) complete elimination (= *parinirvāṇa*).”
The ignorance expressed in the first part defines Bāhulaka again as a layman. Yijing (Takakusu 1896: 195) thought that laymen, in contrast to clerics, had a right to immolate and sacrifice their body.

(A24:) [ta]tha ceva tatra[yiṣita ś]enakara manuṣa pa[di]samotidi •
tathā caiva tatreṣītāḥ śayanakarāḥ manuṣyāḥ pratisammodanti

“And then people will rush there to build the (pyre)-bed and rejoice’.”

The pyre is here called *śayana*, “bed”, and *mañca*, “bed”, in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra.

ani telasa [ca ka]ṭhasa ca maharāśi niyita
ānīya tailasya ca kāṣṭhasya ca mahārāśih nicitah

“(People) brought a large mass of oil and firewood and piled it up.”

tatrayiṣva (A25:) [pa]śate prochati me ta bhaviṣati •
tatra āyuṣmān paśyati pṛcchati me tad bhaviṣyati

“At that point the venerable (Bāhulaka) reflected and asked ‘Could this be for me?’”

It is not clear whether Bāhulaka was asked beforehand. On co-monks behind similar plots cf. Yi-jing 義淨 (Takakusu 1896: 197): “Two or three intimate friends combine and make an agreement among themselves to instigate the young student to destroy their lives.” For the construction cf. *phalam ca me tad bhaveyāt*, Mvu 2.135.

[aas· ayiṣ(v)a ta javana pracava] ...
*āhuh āyuṣman ?tvajjīvanam pratyāva(*rtitam)*

“They said ‘Venerable, ?your life has come back’.”

The predicate is not clear, but a part. of *pratyāvṛt* appears the most likely.

[aha na da]ṇi bhuyo śakani loṇa vo uṭo (A26:) .. [dakṣaṇa]ye²³ •
āha na idānīm bhūyah śākāni lavaṇā vah ūḍhāḥ ... dakṣiṇāyai

“(Bāhulaka) said: ‘(But) then no longer will vegetables (and) salt be brought for you ... as a present’.”

Bāhulaka as a layman reminds the regular monks that because of their scheme they could run out of additional provisions.

tato [r/t· s/t·] <ayiṣa²⁴ vuḍhapiḍhe niṣaṇo •
... āyuṣmān vṛddhapīṭhe niṣannah

“Then ... the Venerable sat down on the accumulated seat.”

u[vaṭhayaga a]ha [ka]ra [pra]kṣa[li]etu •
upasthāyikā āha karau prakṣālayatu

“The femal lay attendant said: ‘You have to make him wash (his) hands’.”

²³. The *chāyā* presupposes a writing mistake of *dakṣaṇaye* for intended *dakṣiṇaye*, comparable to *javana* for *jivana* in the preceding phrase.

²⁴. This passage was partly damaged from the outset, and one short piece which is present on early photographs cannot be found in the final glass frames.

aha ki bhuyo prakṣalidehi²⁵ •

āha kiṁ bhūyaḥ prakṣalitaiḥ

“(Someone else) said: ‘Why still more washings?’”

Follows line 27 which starts with free space for four letters.

(A27:) __[aprakṣalita] pa[takal]a kedaniṣāṇo • eda [ga]sa bhaṣ[i]

aprakṣalitah prāptakālah ketaniṣāṇah. etāṁ gāthāṁ abhāṣīt

“Unwashed at the proper time, he sat down on the construction. He recited this *gāthā*:”

anica vata sakha •

anityā vata saṃskārāḥ [utpādavyayadharminah,

utpadya hi nirūdhyante tāṁ vyupaśamah sukham].

“Truly, the constituents (of living matter) are not eternal, [it is their nature to arise and decay. After arising they dissolve; to put them to rest means bliss.]”

The stanza was spoken by Śakra after the Parinirvāṇa of the Buddha (DN ii, 157) and has been transferred to a great number of younger texts and therefore needed not to be quoted in full. The Sanskrit part supplied is from the Udānavarga 1,3. In its Sanskrit form it was also cut into a rock face near Manglor, Swat (Bühler 1896/97: 134).

eṣa ca gasa bhaṣita parinivuto

eṣā ca gāthā bhāṣitā parinirvṛtah

“And when this *gāthā* was recited he entered Parinirvāṇa.”

(A28:) + .. rasmi + + + + .. • ve •

The *ve* could stand for *peyālah*, “repetition as before”.

tata²⁶nike(da→na) vi dhamarakṣitena eṣa gasa bhaṣita ♣

taptaniketanah eva dharmarakṣitena eṣā gāthā bhāṣitā

“As soon as the construction stood on fire Dharmarakṣita recited the (following) *gāthā*.”

The stanza cited follows below, but is interrupted by the next line which thus appears as a statement on its own, inserted at an improper place, comparable to B19, likewise adding details out of context.

gamigasamghamitrena khalekṣe .. (A29:) [nasti ṇivāṇa śuta]

*gamikasamghamitrena khalakṣe(*tre) nāsti nirvāṇah śrutam*

“When he went out Saṃghamitra heard (the people) on the threshing ground (say) ‘There is no Nirvāṇa’.”

For *gamika* cf. MSV (cīvaraṇastu II: 84) *gamiko bhadanta bhikṣuh piṇḍapātām paryeṣamānah* ... – The *khalakṣetra* is found in the Baudhāyanadharmaśūtra 1.5.9.8 and more. – This most important statement sheds light on the connection between monks and farmers, which is known to have been difficult at times. The fragment has no direct connection to the surrounding script lines, but remaining space at the right border leaves little choice. In addition the verbal statement completes the text of the sentence. Because of identical bends of the *smi* its scribe should be the same as in line A31 where he wrote *pipadhito smi*.

²⁵. The letter *hi* in thick ink is written on top of an other letter, possibly *na*.

²⁶. The second *ta* is markedly different from the first, very angular and without initial curl, exactly like the isolated arm of a *pa*.

śakuto jalamuto va apo²⁷ gho hi ga[chat]i •

sakuntah jālamuktaḥ eva alpam agham hi gacchati

“As soon as a bird is freed from the net it lightly moves up into the sky’.”

The stanza is found Dhammapada 174c,d and Udānavarga 27,5c,d, with the first line (a,b) reading: *andhabhūto ayam loko tanuk’ettha vipassati*, and *andhabhūtas hy ayam lokas tanuko ’tra vipaśyakah*, which was dropped here as it is less suitable for the situation. The Chinese versions of DhP/UdV render the same standard context (Mizuno 1981: 156, no. 174). – The rising of the burned man towards the sky is also found in the oldest Chinese report (Gernet 1960: 532) where a star comes from heaven right into the flames of the pyre only to shoot up again. In a slightly younger report a dragon-like being appears from the smokes and disappears in the sky (Gernet 1960: 535). Caesar and Augustus seem to have supported the idea too.

3. On parents’ permission to leave home for monkhood

Cf. the Śronakoṭīkarṇa-legend (e.g. Wille 1993: 300) on the necessity even for adult sons to receive permission from the parents. Here, the plot consists in making the mother say “go”, without her realizing that the boy intends to leave the house for good. He uses the preparation of food to that aim.

Motif: To trick parents into consenting to a boy’s wish for becoming an ascetic.

[eso] paḍhamo a[bhipra]yo [pravaja]ye •

esah prathamah abhiprāye pravrājyāyai

“The following (*avadāna*) is the first (to cite when there is) the intention to walk away (i.e. to enter the Buddhist order).”

sa madapitu (A30:) .. ·u .. ·u .. [ti] •

sa mātapitoh . . .

“A (boy asked) his mother and father (for permission?) . . .”

The remnants could derive from *anuñām pujati*, where the letter looking like *ja* cannot be the *cha* required for *puchati*.

ta nanuya[na]ti

tau nānūjānāte

“Both did not consent.”

nagarasamaja nigato • tatra bhoci

nagarasamājām nirgataḥ. tatra abhojīt

“He went out for a public festival at *Nagara*. There he ate.”

Apart from relating to just any “town”, *nagara* was also the name-giving town in Nangarhar, near the modern Jalalabad, just west over the pass from Bajaur. The crucial letters reading *samajanigato* were on a small strip at one of the intensely bent sides of the bark roll and are only preserved on early and shady photographs. There, the *ja* resembles *va*, and the *ni* looks like *no* because a smaller strip across the letter had already removed the upper part of the *-o*. – A *samāja* festival is also mentioned on the Śrāvastī Miracle ms (Falk & Steinbrückner 2020: 29, B2c), where it is said that visitors will see “magic tricks” (*vigurva*). Aśoka was not fond of ordinary *samājas*, but favoured *dharmasamājas* (PE1). During a certain Vedic *dikṣā* the future *dīkṣita* is forbidden to look at a *samāja*, a *harmya*, collected bones, corpses and outcastes, obviously all bad omens.²⁸ It seems that sects presented themselves there, offering food with the

²⁷. An *a* was forgotten before *gho*.

²⁸. *na samājām īkṣeta na harmyāṇi na śarīrāṇi na śavāṇi nāntāvasāyinam*, Bhāradvājagrhyasūtra 3.6,19 = Bhāradvājaśrautasūtra 11.21,20.

intention to recruit young men, as it happens today at a Mahāśivarātri festival or *melā*.

udahito so ca tava atho nichino •

udāhṛtaḥ sah ca tava artham niścinu

“And he was addressed: ‘Decide about your aim!’”

We compare *niscitārthah* and expect a finite imperative. The addresser must have been a Buddhist monk but this is not expressly stated.

tena ca vu(A31:)to gase [a]śita aghase ti • pipadhito smi •

tena ca uktam ghaseyam āśitam aghāsam iti, pipāsitaḥ asmi

“And he said: ‘As people say: ‘I want to eat (real) food, not (animal) fodder’. I am thirsty’.”

The center of this text was damaged and has suffered further since the first photographs, which however prove that the first occurrence of the root *ghas* reads without the aspiration. Khar. *āśita* for the clean food presented to monasteries is also found on an unpublished miniature railing stone from Buner. For Skt. **aghāsa* cf. *atṛṇa*, pw. For **ghase* as 1st pers. opt. in -i/e cf. *abaji* (*āvrajeyam*) and *ghache* (*gaccheyam*) in Allon (2001,I: 81, 191) with further examples, and Salomon (2008: 151f.) with *lahe* and *ase*.

vuto cavalo agachea • [na] tava anagadasa eṣo •

uktam capalam āgaccheḥ. na tava anāgatasya eṣaḥ

“The (monk) said ‘May you come soon; this (*āśitaḥ*, good food) is not for you when you have not come’.”

nichiṭiṣi ti

niścartsyāmi iti

“(The boy said/thought): ‘I will untie (myself from the parents)’.”

According to the standard rules **nichiṭiṣe* *ti* is expected. The hand certainly produced a letter looking like *ti*. Prof. Karashima preferred to read *nichijiṣiti* which he linked to P *chijissati*, fut. “to cut off”, allegedly “to miss” the proper time for meal before noon. Apart from the shape of the letter, which can be faulty for various reasons, a prefix *ni* or *nis* to root *chid* is not attested, while *niścṛtya* is found in the Aitareyabrahmaṇa 8.22.5, concerning the removal of side-horses from the yoke.

so (A32:) [gata p·t·mad· aha] cavala ma [bhata]ga [dehi]

so gataḥ pitrmātarau āha capalam me bhaktakam dehi

“He went (home and) said (?to his parents:) ‘Quick, give me some food!’”

The beginning of the line was heavily fragmented but can for the most part be reconstructed from early photos.

aha eṣa pacati •

āha eṣaḥ pacati

“(She) said: ‘It boils’.”

nutiyaka pi tritiyaka pi •

dvitīyakam api, trītyakam api

“(He asked for food) a second time, a third time.”

The laxness concerning final gender-determined vowels is demonstrated by the *-o* in *prasutiko* in an exclusively female term.

so ayiṣpa abhus[i] ○

so āyuṣmān abhūt

“He became a Venerable (?Buddhist monk).”

(B4:) + + + [ik]o [p·] ti .. tito o[v·so/si] v· ti
tatra[yiṣpa] [yi]ṣpa ..

Inexplicable.

(B5:) + + + + + + + + + + .. tiea ♦

The rest of the line is left uninscribed for to level out the following line B6.

5. The *avadāna* of the stolen jewel

Only the wheel preceding this part suggests a new start. A continuation of *avadāna* no. 4 is not excluded nor a continuation in no. 6 which could deal with the end of a, possibly misconceived, thief. The *chāyā* here is not more than a basis for discussion.

(B6:) + + + + + .. tuṣ[o/i] dri + + + [ni/o]tasa p[r]acu[ta] [s]avatra maṇi
aroyito ○

pracyutah sarvatra maṇih

ārocitah.

“ . . . displaced the jewel was described everywhere.”

samakhada bavuda ca

samākhyātah vyāvṛtah ca

“(The theft?) was made public and disclosed.”

tatra[ṭhi] (B7:) + + + + + + .. dh· civiṣu ♦

tatrashti(tāh?) . . .

“People living there . . .”

In this area of the bark the merger of transparent layers is too intensive to decide about their priority and so the reconstruction is tentative. Even the text-ending spoked wheel could belong to the second layer.

6. *Avadāna* of Nāda from yonder world

The *avadāna* presupposes the existence of an evil-doing ghost and it sees two extremes possible for a human life: living by exerting power on the one hand and living in dire straits on the other. The prime reason for the latter are bad thoughts (*papakacittacetasa*) which somehow deliver the person to the evil ghost. All badly off persons are assumed to be in the power of the being from “yonder world”, the world of the dead. That same being is also expected to be capable of removing the spell; however, it seems to be willing to loosen its grip in the case of small children (*dāraka*), probably because these are too small to have any thought at all. How the bad ghost sets the child free we are not told, but some monks can act in his place, probably by applying fumes, spells, stamps and other common means. In case that these means are applied to no avail the would-be doctor needs not to confess a wrong-doing at the next *uposatha* meeting. The being from yonder world comes by the inconspicuous name Nāda, borne also by Buddhist monks (e.g. Falk 2008: 22 = 2013: 163f.). In our case he had arisen from the *cāṇḍāla* community.

The text may suitably be used to explain poverty, low status or ailments as the result of a fickle mind

(B11:) **tato me bhoti ki[ta] edavaśe<ṅ→j>a** ○ [dato] **me bhoti**

tataḥ me bhavati kṛītāḥ etadvaśejah dattāḥ me bhavati

“In addition, someone bought (as a slave) is mine (and) someone who is born in someone’s possession; a donated person is mine.”

aha apapuño aṇatha dubala pusujāṇa sa

aho alpapuṇyāḥ anāthāḥ durbalāḥ pṛthagjanāḥ ca

“Alas, (everyone is mine) who has little merit, and (all) ordinary men without a protector or those being weak.”

The final *sa* is taken as a miscopied *ca*.

neva im̄tro nā balo ya

naiva indrah na balah ca

“Never (will) an Indra (i.e. a king) or mighty (person belong to me).”

ro³⁴(B12:)[ga] raga [samagre] hasta ḥavita

rogāḥ rāgāḥ samagrāḥ hasta sthāpitāḥ

“Sick persons and impassioned persons are completely put into my hand.”

pūṇa achi[d]e [a]tidubalatva dara[kasa]

punar ācchindyām atidurbalatvām dārakasya

“But I could remove too great a weakness from a child.”

sa yēṇa pūṇu achijati vutha na so dukaroti

sa yena punar āchidyate vṛthā na so duṣkaroti

“On the other hand, by whichever (monk such a weakness) is removed without result (in that the child dies nonetheless) he (thereby) does not misbehave (in a monastic legal sense)’.”

naḍo ca ○ (B13:) parivāḍi[to] *

naḍah ca parivartitah

“(So) Naḍa (said) and returned (to yonder world).”

7. *Avadāna* of the house-bound monk

The episode contrasts a serious *śramaṇa* with a rather simple-minded house-monk. There seems to be a joke pun involved around the root *labh*, meant for higher goals by the *śramaṇa* and linked to nothing but food by the house-monk. The morale: house-monks are no serious monks.

[acaria] svakamṭharo[dh]o³⁵ abh[u]ṣi

ācāryah sakānṭharodhah abhūt

“There was a teacher who held his words under control.”

The initial *sa-* of the rare term *sakānṭharodha*, “soft spoken”, is here turned into *sva-*.

³⁴. The *ro* has an unusual form with the *o*-stroke protruding horizontally at mid-height; however, an identical form is found in the Senavarma inscription in the middle of line 2 in *arohapariṇamena*.

³⁵. The *dho* of *rodho* looks more like a *ko*, another case of a reading mistake from an exemplar.

ṇagara[śaye] manusēṇa nimamtrito •

nagareśāye manusyena nimantritaḥ

“While in town he was invited by some person.”

tatra ṣamāṇo kulovako

tatra śramanāḥ kulopakah

“There was (also) a monk who was customarily associated with the family.”

(B14:) **tasa aha iśayeva ta phalapate ○ na hi tatra tadiśaka 1[abhiṣa]ti**

tasya āha iha eva te phalaprāptam. na hi tatra tādrśakah labhiṣyati

“To him the (ācārya) said (smugly): ‘This here is all you want to achieve? Not everybody will achieve this much’.”

[aha] sa[rva] labhiṣati

āha sarve labhiṣyanti

“(The house-monk) said: ‘All can obtain (this)’.”

[yeganakhatrayi](B15:)śpa ta śigaverēṇa [ra→ca] makṣi[ena] ...

ekanakṣatre āyuṣman te śrīgaverēṇa ca mākṣikena ...

“Sir, at (every) one-star-nakṣatra, they (?will even cook) ... with ginger and honey’.”

According to Weber (1862: 322, 380) the said full-moon stations consisting of a single star are *puṣya*, *hasta*, *svāti*, *citrā* and *revatī* and are regarded as optimal for śrāddha rituals. These in turn include obligatory guest invitations. The traditional brahmin guests seem to be replaced by Buddhist monks.

[so manuśo ga ...

so manuṣyah ...

“The man ...”

tasa k]u[1]ovakasa pariviṣamana sarvasakṣayae (B16:) ṣamāṇa *

*tasya kulopakasya pariviṣamāṇa*sya sarva(sya / sam)kṣayāya śramanāḥ*

“Then, while the family monk was being served the śramana (set out) for the complete elimination of everything.”

We expect a haplographical shortening in *pariviṣamana*[sya]. For *sarvasakṣayae* cf. *kleśānām sarva-saṅkṣayam* in the Mahāyānasūtrālaṅkāra and *sarvavitarkakṣayae* in the “Miracle at Śrāvasti” (Falk & Steinbrückner 2020: 21, A8). The standard *kṣaya* concerns āsrava, karman, duḥkha or moha.

8. *Avadāna* of Lohajaka

The plot is difficult to reconstruct. There are two parties, a) a wicked man called Lohajaka, working hand in glove with the archetypically misbehaving Ājīvikas (cf. Lenz 2010: 54). Then there is b) a Mahā-sāṃghika monk who enjoys the confidence of the local king. The wicked try to influence and exploit the king for their own sake, while the monk manages to produce a spell-repelling seal. Our reconstruction makes use of a short passage in the Sāmavidhānabrahmaṇa (3.5.8) which shows that seals kept in the right hand ward off magic enemies: *tāmrarajatajātarūpāyasiṁ mudrāṁ kārayitvoccā te jātam andhasa iti caturyenābhijuhuyāt sahasrakṛtvah śatāvaram. tām mudrāṁ daksīṇena pāṇinā dhārayet. nainam kṛtāni hiṇsanti. tāny eva pratigacchanti.* “Having had a seal made from copper, silver, gold or iron the four stanzas beginning with *uccā te jātam andhasā* have to be recited with accompanying fire oblations a thousand times, (or) at least hundred times. He makes him carry the seal in his right hand. Ghosts will not

hurt him, they even return (home)."

There are numberless seals with the Buddhist creed, *ye dharmā hetuprabhavaḥ* etc., others with imperatives (*dharmakartavyaḥ*, *dātavyaṁ*, *dharmemati* etc.). A great number will have been fashioned to be used "in ritual contexts in order to produce merit" (Skilling 2005: 677), but our text seems to show that apotropaic seals against possession, spells and other malicious forces were known and used too. The idea looks Vedic and thus ancient, at least when we compare the passage from the *Sāmavidhānabrahmaṇa*, but this text belongs to the latest Brāhmaṇas, and needs not be older than our Gandhāran *avadānas*. The idea as such resulted in masses of cut stone seals in late and post-Hellenistic times, particularly in Egypt (Michel 2004), but also in Gandhāra (Rahman & Falk 2011).

Morale: If people are haunted by ghosts relate this *avadāna* as "historical" proof, stamp some clay with a magic seal and have the afflicted hold it in their hand.

+ .. tavaḍhaṇe lobhajako nama

(*vit)tavardhanaḥ lobhajakah nāma

"There was a man, an increaser of wealth, called Lobhajaka."

The emendation to *vittavardhanaḥ* is tentative but lexically sound; however, the name of a locality could be expected as well. The name Lobhajaka occurs elsewhere, "Born from greed."

aha mahasamghigo abhuṣi tēṇa rāja grahito

atha mahāsāṅghikah abhūt tena rājā grhītaḥ

"Then there was a Mahāsāṅghika who had the king under his influence."

tehi acivikehi (B17:) loha[jak·] .. + + + karavito

tebhīr ājīvikaiḥ lobhajakah . . . kāritāḥ

"With some Ājīvika monks Lobhajaka . . . had . . . made."

ma eda am[ñ]eṣa ra]ja[na na ava]muṣeya ti

mā etat anyeṣām rājānām *dāḥ/naya avamuṣeyuḥ iti

"(?They said to the king): '*Give/take this not to other kings! They would steal it'."

Something is wrong with the first predicate. Maybe we encounter another *da/na* misreading, then *mā . . . dāḥ* would be a prohibitive of the oldest form. Or the second *na* is a defective form or a contracted copy of *naya*. The gen. case speaks for *dāḥ*.

aja prada ca[sa]ko³⁶

adya pradā caṣakah

"Today the donation is a goblet."

Lobhajaka and his friends aim at this costly party utensil. For a golden *caṣaka* used for wine by ladies cf. Śiśupālavadha 11,51.

maso ha ḥhi (B18:) + + + + [praviśati]

māsaṁ ha sthi(*tvā) . . . praviśati

"Having stayed [exiled/quiet?] for one month the (Mahāsāṅghika) enters . . . "

tasa ha[ste] mudra kariati ♦

tasya haste mudrā kāryate

"He has a seal (?print) made in (the king's) hand."

³⁶. An original *ki* was overwritten with a bold *o*-vowel stroke.

9. *Avadāna* told by Buddhadeva on noisy *yavanikās*

The background is a celebration of women, “foreign” women that is, enjoying the ceremony called *niskramaṇa*, “taking a baby boy out of the house for the first time”. This event is celebrated in the fourth month after delivery,³⁷ when both mother and baby boy can be expected to have survived the most dangerous period. Closing the festivities a number of women meet, each one clad in *coda*, a term denoting shawls or bands, which seems to include all sorts of underwear, including menstrual rags. The Vinayasūtra forbids *rajaścoda* for monks’ dresses (2.2343 *rajaścodasyānādharaṇe*). Shawls worn visibly can function as a bodice, also known as *ni-coḍa* or *ni-cola*. The seemingly rolled-up menstruation cloth permitted for nuns by the Buddha according to the Bhikṣuṇīvinaya (§§ 268-271) is called *ānīcola*, v.l. *ānicola*, “plug cloth”.³⁸ This text also advises to wash and dye such clothes (2.2345 *kālānukālāṁ asya śocanāṁ rañjanāṁ ca*), and this is exactly what happens in the Mvu (2: 467) where the *codaka* of all the harems-women of King Kuśa go to a specialized washerman (*codakadhovaka*). These washermen seem to have the habit of signing the washed ware. At least in the “King Kuśa” story the hero writes with special ink his name symbol on the *codaka* (*svakām nāmāmkām bhallātakena samjñāmātrakena likhati*). The same happens in the shop of the master dyer (*rajamahattaraka*). Marking can be done by means of a written sign or by a stamp.

Our story ends with the appearance of a man who pretends to be a washerman. Since this citizen approaches empty-handed he must pretend to come for to collect *coda* cloth and we can expect that the women retire to their places to collect the laundry - and thus end the noisy party.

The civilian man says just one word, written *mudrako*, certainly built from *mudrā*, “seal, mark.” The written *mudrako* most likely renders *mudrānka*, “stamped, marked with a seal,” denoting the washed or dyed clothes, and those clothes needing such treatment. From the Mvu we know the habits of the washermen: *codadhoveranakā ... colakānam arikan̄ karom̄ti*, “the *coda* washermen provide the clothes with a sign,” which are subsequently *mudrānkitā*, “seal-marked”, a term probably synonymous with *mudrako*.

After the first one or two sentences yet another stage direction follows: if this *avadāna* is related first, no other story should follow. Reason could be the mundane, absolutely non-Buddhist content which creates a hilarious atmosphere in the audience on which reflections on Buddhist morality or philosophy cannot build. This stage direction should mark the begin of the story, but we find it after the first sentence, a fact that may be due to a copyist inserting a marginal gloss at the wrong place.

budhadevo avadana japat[i]

buddhadevah avadānam jalpati

“Buddhadeva relates this *avadāna*.”

“Western foreigners’ women (?celebrated) the rite around a baby’s first leaving the house (*niskramanakarman*)”

The first graph of the word ending in *·išika* could be *ki*, even *k(r)i*, but also *ha+vi*. *Višikā* is known through Pāṇini (PW “zur Buhlkunst in Beziehung stehend”), while *krišika* (Skt. *kr̥śikā* “lean, slender”) is common. Both would be semantically compatible with the context.

ta ci padhamo katha vikatheatva no amña ca uparito

tad ced prathamām kathām vikathayitvā na anyām ca uparitah

“In case that this story is expanded as the first, no other (story should) follow.”

³⁷ E.g. Manu 2,34; details in Kane *History of Dharmasāstra* II,1, ²1974: 255f., who points to the Saṃskāraratnamālā II: 886ff. (ASS ed.), where numerous mantras and donations are mentioned but no activity of women nor any sort of dancing.

³⁸ Cf. KEWA s.v. *niculah*, Burrow 1937: 7=§18, 91, *cotaga* “clothes”; on *Pānicola* as “kind of tampon” cf. von Hinüber 1970/2005: 34. On *rajaścoda* and its difficulties cf. Schopen 2016: 392.

codap[r?]a(B20:)[b]uta te yonika nacamti ○

codaprāvṛtāḥ te yavanikāḥ nṛtyanti

“Having wrapped themselves in bandages these Yavanikās dance.”

sayi pranacida ○

sāyam pranṛttāḥ

“They dance all through the evening.”

tasa te kathavidha ve[ś]e[ti?] .. ♦

tathā tāḥ kathaṁvidham veśayante

“In which way were they made to rest?”

The spoked wheel here certainly marks no end of the *avadāna*, but rather a rhetorical pause.

pusajano a[nitva ○] (B21:) sarva[s]a[sa]³⁹mayo yonika ṇaḍamaṇa ya

pr̥thagjanam ānītvā sarvasamayam yavanikāḥ nardamānāḥ ca

“They led a civilian to the scene, and while the Yavanikās kept shouting all the time.”

rajago smi mudrako ♦

rajakah asmi mudrāṅkah

“(The citizen said): ‘I am the washerman, (to collect) the sealed (laundry)’.”

Written *rajago* could stand for the professions Skt. *rajaka*, “washerman” or *rañjaka* “dyer, painter”. Comparable cases in the Mvu speak of *codadhovanaka*, and so the simple “washerman” becomes more likely.

10. *Avadāna* told by Upatiṣya on the use of luxury

A king thinks that luxury is a legal constituent of his state as a royal. It was probably the narrator Upatiṣya who had the wits to respond to this statement in such a way that the king can understand that luxury only hides the vulnerability of a human being, but does not change the fragility of its nature.

uvadiśo avadano japatī ○

upatiṣyah avadānam ati

“Upatiṣya tells the (following) *avadāna*.”

rāya (B22:) kici ja[pati] ○

rājā kṛtyam jalpati

“A (certain) king speaks about behavior *comme il faut*:”

On *kicci*, Skt. *kṛtya*, “What needs to be done” cf. Ja 466, 12; for the meaning “what ought to be done” cf. *kṛtyatama*, “anything most proper or fit” (MW); cf. *kica* in Schlosser 2016: index.

ya eta ṣamāṇa japatī an[i]ca dukha[m] ti va

yad etāḥ śramanāḥ jalpanti anityam duḥkham iti eva

“Although these (Buddhist) recluses (use to) say: ‘(Everything) that is not eternal is painful’...”

³⁹ The [sa] has been supplied with a small over-circle, probably to mark it for deletion.

etava mahaghani ca vastrani paruama ○
etāvad mahārghāni ca vastrāṇi prāvṛṇumah
 “still we (royals) put on expensive garments, . . .”

(B23:) .. [hagha ca bhoyana] **bhukṣama** ○
mahārgham ca bhojanam bubhukṣāmah
 “and we eat expensive food, . . .”

mahaghani ca paṇani piva[ma]⁴⁰
mahārghāni ca pānani pibāmah
 “and we drink expensive drinks, . . .”

+++ .. **vilevanani vilim̄va**(B24:) +
[maharghāni ca] vilepanāni vilimpāmah
 “and we anoint ourselves with expensive ointments’.”

+++ .. [sa] .. + [?ti/to ?gra ?ṭha sa]m [?m]o
 This sentence is truncated beyond recovery and must have referred to the activity of a monk.

[aha de]va atra ū[vit·] .. . eta
āha deva, atra jñāpitavyam . . etat
 “He said: ‘King! In this matter you have to be aware of the following’.”

deva mahaghani bhoyaṇani .. (B25:) + [nan]u [jigitsa]ye⁴¹ piḍito <○→bhu>⁴² ja
deva mahārghāni bhojanāni . . . nanu jighatsayā pīḍitah bhunakṣi
 “King! Don’t you eat these expensive dishes not simply because you are tormented by hunger?”

mahagha[ni] ca vastraṇi ūidena pito paruasi •
mahārghāni ca vastrāṇi ūtēna pīḍitah prāvṛṇośi
 “And you put on the expensive dresses because you are tormented by the cold (weather).”

(B26:) + .. [gha]ni ca paṇani pivati⁴⁴ udañae piḍido ○
mahārghāni ca pānāni pibasi udanyayā pīḍitah
 “And you drink expensive drinks because you are tormented by thirst.”

⁴⁰. To *pa* has been added a dot above the arm, and a dot to *va* below its arm for no apparent reason.

⁴¹. It is unclear whether we should read *jighatsaye* or *jigitsaye*; a small spot of ink could be the remains of the additional hook of a *gha*, or belong to the bend of an ordinary *ga*.

⁴². While copying the scribe wrote a • after *piḍito*, then overwrote it with *bhu*.

⁴³. The last letter is a *ca* overwritten by a *dha*, or the other way round, most likely arising while copying a miswritten *si*.

⁴⁴. The scribe first wrote *pivasi*, as would have been correct, then wiped out the lower part of the *sa*, which is still faintly visible though. Possibly, he was discontent with an address in the second person instead of one befitting a *bhavān*.

mahagha[ni] ca vilevaṇaṇi [gra] (B27:) + + + (*vil)[i](*mpa)[si]

*mahārghani ca vilepanāni gr(*hītvā) . . . vilimpasi*

“You take recourse to expensive fragrant ointments . . . and anoint yourself.”

[sa]manvoga[dha]eṇa piḍido ○

sāmānyagandhena piḍitah

“because you are tormented by (your) ordinary smell.”

atra daṇi ki sukho ○

atra idānim kiṁ sukhām

“If things are such, what sort of happiness is this now?”

aha prajalikaro so (B28:) raya ḫhito

āha prāñjalikārah so rājā sthitah

“The king stood up and said with joined hands:”

suṭhu japasi ♦

suṣṭhu jalpasi

“You speak rightly.”

11. *Avadāna* with Buddha Udgama

Content and didactic tenets are not obvious. An elderly person appears and questions a teacher who answers with a reference to the Buddha named Udgama, who is otherwise known only through the Bhadrakalpikasūtra. It could be that the teacher while referring to this Tathāgata misunderstood the term *amba* on purpose, turning G *amba* = Skt. *ambā* “mother, woman” into G *amba* = Skt. *āmra* “mango”.

vudho ganika[p]r· . . u . . . ko a[?śpa]ti ○

*vṛddhah ganikā⁴⁵pr(*iyah) . . .*

“An old man, ?fond of harlots, . . .”

[so] acaria (B29:) aha

so ācāryah āha

“The teacher said:”

yati ugamo budho amba⁴⁶ eśati edatagra la[bhi]ṣati ○

yadi udgamaḥ buddhah ambām/āmram eśati etadagrām labhiṣyati

“If the Buddha (named) Udgama longs for a woman/mango, he will obtain the best of the kind.”

The *tathāgata* spelled *ugama* is also found in the Bhadrakalpikasūtra, called *udgata* in the reconstruction of the Skt. form by Weller (1928: 105, no. 813). The spelling *ugama* in our text is the same as in the

⁴⁵ The reading suffers from several overlapping bark folds. The first letter, *ga*, was written on top of a *na*, and a short stroke of ink or natural dark spot in the bark makes the *ka* look like a *bha*. – For *ganikāpriya* cf. the south-Indian *Svacchandatantra* 8,8.

⁴⁶ The upper curve of the *ba* is as angular as in the case of the *ba* three letters before. However, the letter is less inclined so that the result looks like *ra* or *ve*. A small hole in the bark left of the vertical should not be mistaken for a vowel mark.

slightly younger Khar. fragments published by Baums, Glass and Matsuda (2016: 256). Like all other Buddhas, also *ugama* has a son, but why he should long for a woman escapes us. Alternatively, we could understand *amba* as a form of *āmra*, “mango”, P. Pkt. *amba*. Possibly a pun was intended.

acario a[ha]

ācāryah āha

“The teacher said . . .”

This line ends the page. From the next sheet only fragments remains on the backside of A4 to A1 left end. Whether this continues *avadāna* no. 11 or belongs to another story cannot be defined:

(B30:) ///

(B31:) /// [gh]i te m[i] · . . . aha

(B32:) /// .. ku?de śiṣa gato bhiṇaka

(B33:) /// .. le · sagramo di ..

None of these truncated lines can be reconstructed.

The language

For reasons of space we dispense with a full list of nominal endings, which would simply repeat what has been listed time and again. But we noted sound changes as seen from Sanskrit and, as verbal morphology on the whole is more prone to changes and surprises, we list all verbal forms according to our analysis, which may allow alternatives or even demand correction at places.

Phonology of sibilants

śy→ś	[pa]śate ← <i>paśyati</i> A25, [pa]śati ← <i>paśyati</i> A33 and more.
ṣy→ṣ	bhaviṣati ← <i>bhavyati</i> A25, la[bhi]ṣati ← <i>labhīyati</i> B29, parinivahi[ṣati] ← <i>parinirvahīyati</i> A21/22.
sy→ś	eśati ← <i>eṣati</i> B29; śikṣaviṣe ← <i>śiksāpiṣye</i> A14.
ṣṭh→ṭh	masu[va]ṣiṭhasa ← <i>madhvūṣiṣṭhasya</i> A12/13, [ka]ṭhasa ← <i>kāṣṭhasya</i> A24, suṣṭhu ← <i>suṣṭhu</i> B28.
sth→ṭh	(*pra)[ṭhi]to ← <i>prasthitah</i> A4, vijaṭhana ← <i>vidyāsthāna-</i> A8, A15, uvaṭhayaga ← <i>upasthāyikā</i> A22, uṭhaha[da] ← <i>utthitvā</i> (BHS <i>utthahitvā</i>) B10, ḍhavita ← <i>sthāpitāh</i> B12, svakamṭharo[dh]o ← <i>sakaṇṭharodhah</i> B13, ḍhito ← <i>sthitaḥ</i> B28.
śc→ch	nichiṭiṣi ← <i>niścartṣyāmi</i> A31.

Sandhi

ya-śruti	sayeva ← <i>sah eva</i> A9; tayeva ← <i>tāv eva</i> A18; tatra[yiṣita ← <i>tatra_iṣitāh</i> A24; iśayeva ← <i>iha eva</i> B14; l[abhiṣa]ti[yeganakhatrayi]śpa ← <i>labhīyati eka-nakṣatre āyuṣman</i> B14/15.
praśliṣṭa	tatreva ← <i>tatraiva</i> A10; tatrāyīvata ← <i>tatrāyūṣmatā</i> A14; tat[r]ayiṣva ← <i>tatrāyūṣmān</i> A15; ceva ← <i>caiva</i> A24; nasti ← <i>nāsti</i> A29; nanuya[na]ti ←

nānūjānāte A30; [yeganakhatrayi]śpa ← *ekanakṣatre āyuṣman* B14/15.
hist. etadagra ← *edatagrām* B29.

Hardening of mediae

j→c pratabho[caṇa] ← *prātarbhojanam* A4; pravacitavo ← *pravrajitavyaḥ* A16;
acivikehi ← *ājīvikaiḥ* B16.
ḍh→ṭ uṭo ← *ūḍhāḥ* A25.
d→t upatiṭha ← *upadiṣṭām* A17; uvasapatito ← *upasampāditaḥ* A17; yati ← *yadi* A33.

Lenition of tenuis

k→g śaga[de] ← *śakataḥ* A20.
kṣ→h muhasa[karo] ← *mokṣasatkāraḥ* A23.
ṭ→ḍ śaga[de] ← *śakataḥ* A20.
p→v -nikṣe[vo] ← -nikṣepaḥ A23; orovitava ← *avaropitavyaḥ* A16; uvat[i]tha ← *upadiṣṭaḥ* A17.

Lenition of mediae

j→y pravayi ← *prāvrājīt* A17.

Deaspiration

gh→g gase ← *ghaseyam* A31.
kh→k du[khakam]dhasa ← P. *dukhakhandhassa / duḥkhaskandhasya* A23 = middle
of three aspirates.
ḍh→ṭ uṭo ← *ūḍhāḥ* A25.

Faulty reversal of assumed lenition

y→k kaṣaka ← *kāṣāyam* A16.

Faulty reversal of assumed spirantization

s→dh pipadhitō ← *pipāsitaḥ* A31.

Verbal morphology

Present

Indicative - narrative

1st sg. ichami ← IS: *icchāmi* A14/15; śakomi ← ŠAK: *śaknomi* B9; śikṣami ← ŠIKṢ: *śikṣāmi* A12; smi ← AS: *asmi* A8, A31, A34, B21.
2nd sg. japasi ← JALP: *jalpasi* B28; paruasi ← *pra-ā-VR*: *prāvṛṇośi*, P *pārupasi* B25;
pivati ← PĀ: *pibasi* B26; *bhujasi ← BHUJ: *bhunaksi* B25; (*vil)i(*mpa)si ← *vi-LIP*: *vilimpasi* B27.
3rd sg. asti ← AS: *asti* A14, A16, A29; eśati ← IS: *eṣati* B29; kramati ← KRAM: *kramati* A11; kṣovati ← KṢUBH: *kṣobhate / kṣubhyati* A6 (s. § Vedic); gachati ← GAM: *gacchati* A29; japatī ← JALP: *jalpati* B18, B21, B22; dukaroti ← *dus-KR*: *duṣkaroti* B12; nivatati ← *ni-VRT*: *nivartati* A9; pacati ← PAC: *pacati* A32; paśati ← DRŚ: *paśyati* A6, A33; paṣate ← DRŚ: *paśyati* A25; prachadi ←

PRCH: *prcchati* A22; *praviśati* ← *pra-VIŚ*: *praviśati* B18; *pravayati* ← *pra-VRAJ*: *pravrajati* A19; *prochati* ← *PRCH*: *prcchati* A25; *bhuti* ← *BHŪ*: *bhavati* A16; *bhoti* ← *BHŪ*: *bhavati* B10, B11; *sti* ← *AS*: *asti* A15.

1st pl. *paruama* ← *pra-ā-VR*: *prāvṛṇumah* B22; *pivama* ← *PĀ*: *pibāmah* B23; *viliṁva(*ma)* ← *vi-LIP*: *vilimpā*mah* B23.

3rd du/pl. *japati* ← *JALP*: *jalpanti* B22; *nacamti* ← *NRT*: *nṛtyanti* B20; *pañsamotidi* ← *prati-sam-MUD*: *pratisammodanti* A24; *nanuyanati* ← *JÑĀ*: *nānūjānāte* A30; *śayati* ← *ŚRI*: *śrayanti* B1; *sabhoti* ← *sam-BHŪ*: *sambhavanti* B2.

Imperative

2nd sg. *upaṇaya* ← *upa-Nī*: *upanaya* B10; *ehi* ← *ā-I*: *ehi* A12; *gacha* ← *GAM*: *gaccha* A33; *dehi* ← *DĀ*: *dehi* A32; *nichino* ← *nis-CI*: *niścinu* A30; *prena* ← *pra-INV*: *prenva* A12; *brohi* ← *BRŪ*: *brūhi* A14; *bhikṣahi* ← *BHS* *bhikṣāhi*, Skt. *BHIKS*: *bhikṣa* A33.

3rd pl. *prakṣalietu* ← *pra-KSAL*: *prakṣālayatu* A26.

Optative

1st sg. *gase* ← *GHAS*: *ghaseyam* A31; *vadea* ← *VAD*: *vadeyam* A12; *achide* ← *ā-CHID*: *ācchindyām* B12.

2nd sg. *agachea* ← *ā-GAM*: *āgaccheḥ* A31.

3rd sg. *siya* ← *AS*: *syāt* B8.

3rd pl. *avamuṣeya* ← *ava-MUŚ*: *avamuṣeyuḥ* B17.

Causative

3rd sg. *adhivaseti* ← *adhi-VAS*: *adhivāsayati* A33; *vešeti* ← *VIŚ*: *veśayante* B20.

Desiderative

1st pl. *bhukṣama* ← *BHUJ*: *bubhukṣāmah* B23.

Passive

3rd sg. *ñaiti* ← *JÑĀ*: *jñāyate* A23; *nuḍati* (**nujati*) ← *NUD*: *nudyate* A17; *achijati* ← *ā-CHID*: *ācchidyate* B12.

Passive causative

3rd sg. *kariati* ← *KR*: *kāryate* B18.

Future

1st sg. *nichiṭiṣi* ← *nis-CRT*: *niścartsyāmi* A31.

3rd sg. *pariṇivahiṣati* ← *pari-nir-VAH*: *parinirvahisyati* A21/22; *bhaviṣati* ← *BHŪ*: *bhaviṣyati* A23, A25; *labhiṣati* ← *LABH*: *labhiṣyati* B14, B29.

3rd pl. *labhiṣati* ← *LABH*: *labhiṣyanti* B14.

Future causative

1st sg. *śikṣaviṣe* ← *ŚIKS*: *śikṣāpiṣye* A14.

Preterite

3rd sg. *anvavati* ← *anu-KR*: *anvakārīt* A10; *abhuṣi* ← *BHŪ*: Skt. *abhūt*, P. *ahosi*, BHS *abhūṣi* A18, B3, B9, B13, B16; *abhoṣi* dto. A22; *pravayi* ← *pra-VRAJ*: *prāvṛājīt* A17; *proṣi* ← *pra-VAS*: *prāvātsūt* A3; *bhaṣi* ← *BHĀŚ*: *abhaṣīt* A27; *bhuṣi* ← *BHŪ*: P. *ahosi*, Skt. *abhūt* A18; *bhoci* ← *BHUJ*: *abhojīt* A30.

Perfect

3rd sg. *aha* ← *AH*: *āha* A8, A9, A12, A14, A15, A16, A23, A25, A26, A32, B2, B14, B24, B27, B29.

3rd pl. *ahasu* ← *AH*: *āhuḥ*, BHS *āhamṣu* A21; *aas*· dto A25.

Participles present

naḍamaṇa ← *NARD*: *nardamāṇāḥ* B21.

Participles passive

pariviṣamana ← *pari-VIS*: *pariviṣyamāṇa***sya* B15.

Participles preterite

anagadasa ← *ā-GAM*: *anāgatasya* A31; anuñato ← *anu-JÑĀ*: *anujñātāḥ* A33; aprakṣalita ← *pra-KṢAL*: *aprakṣālītāḥ* A27; aroyito ← *ā-RUC*: *ārocitāḥ* B6; uṭo ← *VAH*: *ūḍhāḥ* A25; udahito ← *ud-ā-HR*: *udāhṛtāḥ* A30; upatiṭha ← *upa-DIŚ*: *upadiṣṭām* A17; uvakalito ← *upa-KAL*: *upakalitāḥ* A14; uvatiṭha ← *upa-DIŚ*: *upadiṣṭāḥ* A17; uviṭho ← *ud-VIŚ*: *udviṣṭāḥ* B9; osriṭha ← *ava-SRJ*: *avasṛṣṭam* A7; kita ← *KRĪ*: *krītāḥ* B11; gata ← *GAM*: *gataḥ* A32; (gramo)gato ← *GAM*: *grāmagataḥ* A4; grahito ← *GRH*: *grīhitāḥ* A13, B16; niyita ← *ni-CI*: *nicitāḥ* A24; ḥhito ← *STHĀ*: *sthitāḥ* B2, B28; tata-(nike(da→na)) ← *TAP*: *taptaniketanāḥ* A28; dato ← *DĀ*: *dattāḥ* B11; duladha ← *dus-LABH*: *durlabdham* B10; nigato ← *nis-GAM*: *nirgataḥ* A30; nito ← *Nī*: *nītāḥ* A13; nimamtrito ← *ni-MANTRAY*: *nimantritāḥ* B13; niṣaṇo ← *ni-SAD*: *niṣannāḥ* A26; (keda)niṣaṇo ← *ketaniṣannāḥ* A27; pata(kala) ← *pra-ĀP*: *prāptakālāḥ* A27; parinivuto ← *pari-nis-VR*: *parinirvṛtāḥ* A27; pariprato ← *pari-pra-ĀP*: *pariprāptāḥ* A5; pariśudho ← *pari-ŚUDH*: *pariśuddhaḥ* A22; piḍito ← *PīD*: *piḍitāḥ* B25, piḍido B26, B27, pito B25; pracava.. .. ← *prati-ā-VRT*: *pratyāva(*ṛtitam)* A25; pracuta ← *pra-CYU*: *pracyutāḥ* B6; praṇacida ← *pra-NRT*: *pranṛttāḥ* B20; (*pra)ḥhito ← *pra-STHĀ*: *prasthitāḥ* A4; (phala)pate ← *pra-ĀP*: *phalaprāptam* B14; (coda)prabuta ← *pra-ā-VR*: *codaprāvṛtāḥ* B19/20; bavuda ← *vi-ā-VR*: *vyāvṛtāḥ* B6; bhamte(citacedasikehi) ← *BHRAM*: *bhrāntacittacetasiκaiḥ* B8; bhaṣita ← *BHĀŚ*: *bhāṣitā* A27, A28; (jala)muto ← *MUC*: *jālamuktaḥ* A29; (tatra)yiṣita ← *IŚ*: *tatreṣitāḥ* A24; vuḍho ← *VRDH*: *vrddhaḥ* B28; vuḍha(piḍhe) ← *VRDH*: *vrddhapīṭhe* A26; vuto ← *VAC*: *uktām* A30, A31, A33; ś·ta(citacetasiκa) ← *ŚAM*: *śāntacittacetasiκān* B9; ṣuta ← *ŚRU*: *śrūtām* A29; samķṣiteṇa ← *sam-KSIP*: *samķṣiptena* B7; samakhada ← *sam-ā-KHYĀ*: *samākhyātāḥ* B6; samavano ← *sam-ā-PAD*: *samāpannāḥ* A6; hato ← *HAN*: *hataḥ* B7.

Participle causative

anisaravita ← *nis-SR*: *aniḥsārītāḥ*, BHS *aniḥsārāpītāḥ* A32; uvasapatito ← *upa-sam-PAD*: *upasāmpādītāḥ* A17; karavito ← *KR*: *kārītāḥ* / BHS *kārāpītāḥ* B17; ḥhavita ← *STHĀ*: *sthāpītāḥ* B12; parivaḍito ← *pari-VRT*: *parivartītāḥ* B13; -sanahita ← *sam-NAH*: *-saṁnāhitāḥ* A5.

Gerundive

utava ← *VE*: *ūtavyām* A16; orovitava ← *ava-RUH*: *avaropitavyāḥ* A16; ñavita ← *JÑĀ*: *jñāpītavyam* B24; datava ← *DĀ*: *dātavyam* B10; pravacitavo ← *pra-VRAJ*: *pravrajītavyāḥ* A16; vatitavo ← *VRT*: *vartītavyam* A16.

Infinitive

katu ← *KR*: *kartum* A6; upadedu ← *ud-PAD*: *utpādayitum* B9/10.

Absolutive I, Skt. in *-tvā*

anitva ← *ā-Nī*: *ānītvā* B20; abhiutarita ← *abhi-ud-TR*: *abhyuttaritvā* A18; uṭhahada ← *ud-STHĀ*: BHS *utthahitvā*, Skt. *utthitvā* B10; vikatheatva ←

KATH: *vikathayitvā* B19; *ṭhi* ← STHĀ: *sthi*tvā* B17.

Absolutive II, Skt. in -ya

ani ← *ā-Nī*: *ānīya* A24 (or defective *anitva*, s. above Abs. I).

Acknowledgement

This text was first reread with Profs. Seishi Karashima, Noriyuki Kudo and T. Tamai in spring 2016, at the IRIAB institute, Soka University, at Hachioji. Timothy Lenz helped with advice and literature, checked the English and made a number of most valuable suggestions. To all contributors we are deeply beholden.

References

Anālayo
2011 *A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya. Volume 1 (Introduction, Studies of Discourses 1 to 90)*. Taipei.

Allon, Mark
2001 *Three Gāndhārī Ekottarikāgama-Type Sūtras – British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 12 and 14 (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts, 2)*. Washington.

Baums, Stefan, Andrew Glass and Kazunobu Matsuda
2016 Fragments of a Gāndhārī Version of the Bhadrakalpikasūtra. Jens Braarvig (ed.), *Buddhist Manuscripts Volume IV (Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection)*. Oslo (Hermes Publ.): 183–266.

Benn, James A.
2007 *Burning for the Buddha: Self-Immolation in Chinese Buddhism* (Studies in East Asian Buddhism, 19). Hawai'i (University of Hawai'i Press).

Bühler, G.
1896/7 “Three Buddhist inscriptions in Swat.” *Epigraphia Indica* 4: 133–135.

Burrow, T.
1937 *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*. Cambridge (Cambridge University Press).

Falk, Harry
2008 “Two new Buddhist Kharoṣṭhī seals from Gandhara.” *Indo-Asiatische Zeitschrift* 12: 19–24; repr. 2013: 160–165.
2011 “The ‘Split’ Collection of Kharoṣṭhī texts.” *ARIRIAB* 14: 12–23.
2013 *Hariṣyenalekhapañcāśikā – Fifty Selected Papers on Indian Epigraphy and Chronology selected and prepared for publication with indices by Britta Schneider and Ingo Strauch*. Bremen.
2014a “The first-century Copper-plates of Helagupta from Gandhāra hailing Maitreya.” *ARIRIAB* 17: 3–26.
2014b “Owners’ graffiti on pottery from Tissamaharama.” *Zeitschrift für Archäologie Außer-europäischer Kulturen* 6: 45–94.
2015 “A new Gāndhārī Dharmapada (Texts from the Split Collection 3).” *ARIRIAB* 18: 23–62.
2021a “Two fragmentary Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions.” *ARIRIAB* 24: 7–16.
2021b “Revision of Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions in the Light of New Material.” *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 30, 2020–2021: 113–142.

Falk, Harry & Seishi Karashima
2012 “A first-century *Prajñāpāramitā* manuscript from Gandhāra – *parivarta* 1 (Texts from the Split Collection 1).” *ARIRIAB* 15: 19–61.
2013 “A first-century *Prajñāpāramitā* manuscript from Gandhāra – *parivarta* 5 (Texts from the Split Collection 2).” *ARIRIAB* 16: 97–169.

Falk, Harry & Elisabeth Steinbrückner
2020 “A metrical version from Gandhāra of the ‘Miracle at Śrāvastī’ (Texts from the Split Collection 4).” *ARIRIAB* 23: 3–42.

Gnoli, Raniero with the assistance of T. Venkatacharya
1977/78 *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu, Being the 17th and Last Section of the*

Gernet, Jacques

1960 "Les suicides par le feu chez les bouddhistes chinoises du V^e au X^e siècle." *Mélanges publiés par l'Institut des hautes études chinoises, II* [à la mémoire de Marcel Granet et de Paul Pelliot], (Bibliothèque de l'Institut des hautes études chinoises, 14). Paris (Presses universitaires de France): 527–558.

Gunatilaka, R.A.

1967 *An edition with translation of the Buddhist Sanskrit text Samghāṭasūtra*, Ph.D. dissertation, Cambridge [after www.uwest.edu/sanskritcanon, Sūtra section, text no. 45].

Hinüber, Oskar von

1970 "Bemerkungen zum Critical Pāli Dictionary." *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* 84: 177–186, cited from the English translation in *Selected Papers on Pāli Studies*. Oxford 2005: 25–38.

2000 Review of "Bechert, Heinz e.a.: Der Buddhismus. I; Stuttgart 2000". *IJ 45*: 77–86.

Karashima, Seishi

2014 "The Language of the Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ — The Oldest Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Text." *ARIRIAB* 17: 77–88.

Karashima, Seishi & Margarita I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya

2012 "The Avadāna Anthology from Merv, Turkmenistan." S. Karashima & I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya (eds.), *The St. Petersburg Sanskrit Fragments (STPSF), I* (Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia). Tokyo: 145–523.

Kieffer-Pülz, Petra

2016 "Samānavassika 'Those who keep the rains together' or 'those of equal numbers of rains'?" *ARIRIAB* 19: 81–100.

Lamotte, Étienne

1970 *Le traité de la grande vertue de sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra), t. III* (Publications de l'Institut Orientaliste de Louvain, 2). Louvain.

Lenz, Timothy

2002 *A New Version of the Gāndhārī Dharmapada and a Collection of Previous-Birth Stories – British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 16 + 25* (Gandhārī Buddhist Texts, 3). Seattle / Washington (University of Washington Press).

2010 *Gandhārī Avadānas – British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 1–3 and 21 and Supplementary Fragments A–C* (Gandhārī Buddhist Texts, 6). Seattle / Washington (University of Washington Press).

forthc. *Further Gandhārī Avadānas – British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 4*.

Li, Rongxi

2000 *Buddhist Monastic Tradition of Southern Asia – A Record of the Inner Law Sent Home from the South Seas by Śramaṇa Yijing. Translated from the Chinese (Taishō Volume 54, Number 2125)*. Berkeley.

Lüders, Heinrich, Ernst Waldschmidt & Ananda Mehendale

1963 *Bharhut Inscriptions* (Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum II,2). Ootacamund.

Malalasekera, G. P.

1937 *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names, I: A-Dh.* London.

Marshall, John

1915 "Excavations at Bhīṭā." J. Marshall (ed.), *Archaeological Survey of India - Annual Report 1911-12*. Calcutta: 29–94.

Michel, Simone

2004 *Die magischen Gemmen. Zu Bildern und Zauberformeln auf geschnittenen Steinen der Antike und Neuzeit* (Studien aus dem Warburg-Haus, 7). Berlin.

Mizuno, Kōgen 水野弘元

1981 法句經の研究 Hokkukyō no Kenkyū [A Study of the Dharmapada]. Tokyo (春秋社 Shunjūsha).

Rahman, Aman ur and Harry Falk

2011 *Seals, Sealings and Tokens from Gandhāra* (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, 21). Wiesbaden.

Rhys Davids, T.W.

1890 *The Questions of King Milinda Translated from the Pāli* [vol. 1]. Oxford.

Roy, Sitaram

1971 *Suvarṇavarṇāvadāna – Decipherment and historical study of a palm-leaf Sanskrit manuscripts – an unknown Mahāyāna(avadāna) text from Tibet* (Historical Research Series, 7). Patna [after Thesaurus Literaturae Buddhicae = <https://www2.hf.uio.no/polyglotta/>].

Salomon, Richard

1999 *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra – The British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments*. Seattle (University of Washington Press).

2008 *Two Gāndhārī Manuscripts of the Songs of Lake Anavatapta (Anavatapta-gāthā)* (British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 1 and Senior Scroll 14) (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts, 5). Seattle / London.

2014 “Gāndhārī Manuscripts in the British Library, Schøyen and Other Collections.” Harrison, P.M. & J.-U. Hartmann, *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research: Papers Presented at the Conference Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: the State of the Field, Stanford, June 15-19, 2009* (Denkschriften der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-Historische Klasse, 460 = Beiträge zur Kultur- und Geistesgeschichte Asiens, 80): 1–17.

2018 *The Buddhist Literature of Ancient Gandhāra – An Introduction with Selected Translations*. Somerville.

Schopen, Gregory

2016 “A tough-talking nun and women’s language in a Buddhist monastic code.” D. Gunkel, J. T. Katz, B. Vine & M. Weiss (eds.), *Sahasram Ati Srajas – Indo-Iranian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of Stephanie W. Jamison*. Ann Arbor / New York: 385–398.

Silverlock, B.A.

2015 *An Edition and Study of the Gosīga-sutra, the Cow-Horn Discourse (Senior Collection scroll no. 12): An Account of the Harmonious Añarudha Monks*. Dissertation, University of Sidney.

Sircar, D.C.

1943 “Two Brāhmī inscriptions.” *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* 39: 41–48.

Schlosser, Andrea

2016 *On the Bodhisattva Path in Gandhāra – Edition of Fragment 4 and 11 from the Bajaur Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Manuscripts*. Dissertation; Freie Universität Berlin, version of 2016.

Scott, H.R.

1904-8 “The Nāsik (Joghalembhi) Hoard of Nahapāna’s Coins.” *JBBRAS* 22: 243–244.

Skilling, Peter

2005 “‘Buddhist sealings’: Reflections on Terminology, Motivation, Donors’ Status, School-Affiliation, and print-Technology.” Catherine Jarrige and Vincent Lefèvre (eds.). *South Asian Archaeology 2001. Vol. II, Historical Archaeology and Art History*. Paris: 677–685.

Takakusu, J.

1896 *A Record of the Buddhist Religion as Practiced in India and the Malay Archipelago (A.D. 671–695) by I-Tsing*. Oxford (Clarendon Press).

Weber, Albrecht

1862 “Die vedischen Nachrichten von den naxatra (Mondstationen), zweiter Teil.” *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin aus dem Jahre 1861*. Berlin (F. Dümmler): 287–400.

Weller, Friedrich

1928 *Tausend Buddhanamen des Bhadrakalpa – Nach einer fünfsprachigen Polyglotte*. Leipzig (Verlag der Asia Major).

Wille, Klaus

1993 “Die Śrōṇakoṭīkarna-Fragmente der Sammlung Pelliot.” R. Grünendahl, J.-U. Hartmann & P. Kieffer-Pülz (eds.), *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde – Festgabe für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert* (Indica et Tibetica, 22). Bonn (Indica et Tibetica Verlag): 292–302.

Winternitz, Morice

1933 *A History of Indian Literature, II: Buddhist Literature and Jaina Literature*. Calcutta.

Wojtilla, Gyula

n.d. *Glossary – A collection of words pertaining to Sanskrit agricultural vocabulary – Contributions to Sanskrit lexicography*. (On academia.edu).

PLATE 6

Fig. 1. Side A, Split Collection



Fig. 2. Side B, Split Collection

